DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 929 HE 011 47?

AUTHOR Rives, Stanley G.; And Others
TITLE Illinois State University Kellogg Project. Professional Development Center. Teaching-Learning Center. Third Annual Report, 1978.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Univ., Normal.; Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *College Faculty; Consultants; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Instructional Programs; Models; *Professional Development; Sabbatical Leaves; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Workshops; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois State University; *Kellogg Foundation; Midcareer Change

ABSTRACT

The third year report of a four-year Kellogg project to develop a model faculty and instructional development program is presented. The goals for the third year are outlined and details of the activities of the Teaching-Learning Center are discussed. Among the activities described are consulting with faculty members, funding to enable faculty to attend off-campus meetings related to teaching, and leading and organizing workshops. It is explained that in preparation for the fourth year summative evaluation, the center is gathering data for the assessment process. The rationale and implementation of a new concept in the functioning of the center is explored, and dissemination activities, such as a conference on "Post-Compulsory Education in the 1980's," are summarized. The goals of the Professional Development Center are identified, and third year activities--including the educational leave program, faculty consultation, and workshop and training sessions--are considered. Dissemination activities of the program and a case study of educational leave are reviewed. Much of the report is in the form of appended texts of dissemination materials, including the following: "Professional Development and Teaching-Learing Centers at Illinois State University" (Stanley G. Rives); "Staff in Staff Development" (John B. Sharpham); "Faculty Training for Mid-Career Change" (Elmer Van Egmond); "Evaluating Staff Development Programs" (D. B. Rhodes); and "A Test of the Radiation of Information from Two Human Resource Workshops" (Melvin A. Goldstein). (PHB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

THE KELLOGG PROJECT

ED177929

Third Annual Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ill. State

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Teaching Learning Center

The Professional Development Center

W. K. Kellogg Foundation & Illinois State University

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY KELLOGG PROJECT

Professional Development Center
Teaching-Learning Center

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT
1978

Illinois State University, the first public institution of higher education established in Illinois, was founded in 1857. It presently serves 19,250 on-campus students with a faculty of 1,300 individuals. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation and Illinois State University jointly sponsor the Professional Development Center and the Teaching-Learning Center to serve the University and its faculty and to develop a model faculty and instructional development program for similar institutions of higher education.

Illinois State University
W. K. Kellogg Foundation Project
Professional Development Center
Teaching-Learning Center

December 15, 1978

Dr. Peter Ellis, Program Director
W. K. Kellogg Foundation
400 North Avenue
Battle Creek, Michigan 49016

Dear Dr. Ellis:

This Third Annual Report on the Kellogg Project at Illinois State University is intended to fulfill our responsibility to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for a narrative summary of accomplishments in our third year. Together with the 1976 First Annual Report and the 1977 Second Annual Report, we now have a chronicle of three years of our four-year joint venture toward creating a model faculty and instructional development program for use by institutions of higher education similar to Illinois State University.

Preparing this report has provided each of us associated with the project a meaningful opportunity to reflect upon what we are doing and why we are doing these things. The report contains (1) a description of third-year activities of the Teaching-Learning Center, (2) a similar description of third-year activities of the Professional Development Center, and (3) a series of materials produced regarding the Kellogg Project at Illinois State University. As a part of our continuing dissemination effort, this report is being circulated to colleges and universities about the nation interested in faculty and instructional development programs.

Reflecting upon the third year of the Kellogg Project at ISU, I believe our major accomplishments during 1978 have been: (1) We have continued and further refined the activities of the Teaching-Learning Center through the imaginative leadership of Dr. John Sharpham, Director of the TLC, and the five Kellogg Associates; (2) We have completely implemented the Educational Leave program for retraining of faculty through the creative leadership of Dr. Elmer Van Egmond, Director of the Professional Development Center; (3) We have secured approval of both the Illinois Board of Regents and the Illinois Board of Higher Education for the final phase-in of financial support to assure continuation of the project beyond the initial four years of existence guaranteed by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation funding; (4) We have begun the summative evaluation process outlined in the Second Annual Report as a primary activity of the fourth year of the project; and (5) We have

Normal-Bloomington, Illinois
Phone: 309/438-2531

North and Fell
Normal, Illinois 61761

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University

developed a plan for a national dissemination conference at ISU in October of 1979, the purposes of which will be to share the model developed at this University with similar institutions of higher education and to provide a national forum for discussion of the future of faculty and instructional development programs in the 1980s. As the individual reports on the Teaching-Learning and Professional Development Centers indicate, we have exceeded our initial expectations with regard to the numbers of individual members of the faculty of the University who have become involved in activities of the TLC and PDC. Further, we have experimented this year with the new concept of "targeting" in an attempt to focus the resources of both the Teaching-Learning and Professional Development Centers on the needs of particular academic departments.

During 1978, Illinois State University experienced an accreditation visit by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association. We are pleased to report that the NCA Evaluation Team Report identified the Kellogg Project as one of ten institutional strengths: "The University's faculty development program, initiated with assistance from the Kellogg Foundation, is an innovative and constructive effort to maintain faculty vitality."

In January of 1979 you will receive from us a financial report on project expenditures from January 1 to December 31 of 1978 and a proposed budget for 1979. As we move from the third to the fourth year in the life of our Kellogg Project, our focus changes from implementation and formative evaluation to summative evaluation. Therefore, our 1979 Fourth Annual Report will concern itself primarily with a final evaluation of the total project. We continue to be pleased that the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has been an active partner in enabling Illinois State University to develop a faculty and instructional development program which we believe is a model for similar institutions about the nation.

Respectfully,

Stan Rives

Stanley G. Rives, Project Director
Associate Provost and Dean
of Undergraduate Instruction
Illinois State University

SR:cy

cc: President Lloyd Watkins
Provost James Horner
Dr. John Sharpham
Dr. Elmer Van Egmond

KELLOGG PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project Director

Dr. Stanley G. Rives, Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction

Program Staff

Dr. John Sharpham, Director, Teaching-Learning Center
Dr. Elmer Van Egmond, Director, Professional Development Center
Ms. Cheryl Young, Project Secretary

Kellogg Associates, Teaching-Learning Center, 1978-79

Dr. Geraldine Greenlee, Associate Professor of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance
Dr. Lanny Morreau, Associate Professor of Special Education
Dr. Leonard Schmaltz, Associate Professor of Psychology.
Dr. Else Schmidt, Professor of Geography
Dr. Gary Sudano, Associate Professor of Music

Continuing Kellogg Associates

Dr. Paul Baker, Professor of Sociology, 1977-78
Dr. Gary Fish, Associate Professor of Accounting. 1976-77
Dr. Lucia Getsi, Assistant Professor of English, 1977-78
Dr. Bessie Hackett, Professor of Home Economics, 1976-77
Dr. Franzie Loepp, Professor of Industrial Technology, 1977-78
Dr. Patricia Marcum, Assistant Professor of Business Education and Administrative Services, 1977-78
Dr. Earl Reitan, Professor of History, 1976-77
Dr. Dent Rhodes, Professor of Education, 1976-78

Kellogg Project Advisory Committee

Dr. Neal Gamsky, Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs
Dr. Douglas Hartley, Professor of Art
Dr. James Horner, Vice President and Provost
Dr. Normand Madore, Professor of Education
Ms. Wendy Moran, Undergraduate Student
Mr. James Pruyne, Graduate Student
Dr. Earl Reitan, Professor of History
Dr. Stanley Rives, Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction
Dr. John Sharpham, Director, Teaching-Learning Center
Dr. Kathryn Smith, Associate Professor of Home Economics
Dr. Edward Streeter, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Dr. Elmer Van Egmond, Director, Professional Development Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Transmittal	ii
Kellogg Project Personnel	iv
Table of Contents	v
The Teaching-Learning Center: The Third Year	2
Introduction	2
Teaching-Learning Center, 1978	2
Individual Needs and Requests	2
Groups, Departments and Colleges	3
University-Wide Programs and Workshops	4
Evaluation	5
Targeting	5
Dissemination	9
The Professional Development Center: The Third Year	10
Introduction	10
The Educational Leave Program	10
Individual Consultation	12
General Program Activities	12
Dissemination Activities	14
Case Study of an Educational Leave	15
Appendix: Dissemination Activities	18
A. "Professional Development and Teaching-Learning Centers at Illinois State University" by Stanley G. Rives	19
B. "Staff in Staff Development" by John R. Sharpham	26
C. "Faculty Training for Mid-Career Change" by Elmer Van Egmond	36
D. "Evaluating Staff Development Programs" by D. M. Rhodes	43
E. "A Test of the Radiation of Information from Two Human Resource Workshops" by Melvin A. Goldstein	51

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY KELLOGG PROJECT

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

Teaching-Learning Center
Professional Development Center

Stanley G. Rives, John R. Sharpham, Elmer E. Van Egmond

This paper describes the third
year activities of the Kellogg Project
at Illinois State University

Submitted to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation by
Illinois State University
December, 1978

THE TEACHING-LEARNING CENTER: THE THIRD YEAR

Introduction

In reviewing the Programmatic Goals Timetable for the Project, the original proposal specified three evaluation criteria for the Teaching-Learning Center during its third year: (1) involvement of at least fifty faculty members in instructional improvement projects; (2) sponsorship of a minimum of four workshops or conferences for interested faculty; and (3) formative and summative evaluation of Center activities based on 75 faculty members who have utilized services and six workshop/conferences held to date. As well as meeting these goals for the year, the Center has added a new dimension to its other activities, that of targeting a few, specific departments.

The Center has continued to meet the criteria set out in the first two items: 350 faculty members have participated in some eighteen workshops or seminars. The Center, because of the new "targeting" procedures has begun to modify the broad-based approach to working with faculty members used in the first two years. The Center continues to (a) work with faculty on an individual basis; (b) support requests from groups of faculty from departments, and from colleges; and (c) institute University-wide programs and workshops. The following report will give details of the Center's activities, explain the evaluation procedures being used and explain, in some detail, the targeting procedures instituted in this, the third year, of the Teaching-Learning Center.

Teaching-Learning Center, 1978

The Center continues to operate with a Director and a team of Kellogg Associates, faculty members who have assigned time to work for the Center. A new team of Associates, the third such team, began working for the Center in the Fall, 1978. It was impossible to continue a past Associate into the current year and so the team is entirely new. The Associates are: Lanny Morreau, Department of Special Education, who has a half-time assignment; Geraldine Greenlee, Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; Len Schmaltz, Department of Psychology; Else Schmick, Department of Geography/Geology; and Gary Sudano, Department of Music (the latter four individuals each have a quarter-time assignment with the Center). A new secretary, Cheryl Young, has joined the team with the resignation of Carol Camper who served so capably for the first two years.

Individual Needs and Requests

The Center continues to provide ongoing consultation for faculty members who have sought assistance or identified specific concern areas in their teaching. Although the number continues to be small, there has been an increase in the number of faculty members working with the Center on an individual basis. One faculty member worked closely with the Director on improving a discussion format in her class while two faculty members are working to improve their lecturing style through

videotape/analysis of their teaching. The Center has provided other faculty with assistance in role-playing techniques, in curriculum development, and in writing grant proposals for Instructional Development Program support.

The Center continues to support some individual requests from faculty for financial assistance to attend off-campus meetings related to teaching. The Center usually provides such faculty with partial funding in conjunction with other University funding agencies. A professor of Psychology received Center sponsorship to attend an Institute on the Teaching of Psychology to Undergraduates at the University of Illinois, while a professor of Biology attended the Eleventh Symposium of Scanning Electron Microscopy in Los Angeles, California, with Center support. Similar support has been given to the following: a professor of Art to attend an International Arts meeting in Australia; a professor of English to attend the Ninth Annual meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies in Chicago; a team of five professors to present a workshop at the American Council of Early Childhood Education at Charlotte, North Carolina; a professor of Agriculture to participate in a course in Floriculture Crop Production; a professor of Economics and several Doctor of Arts candidates to present debut papers on teaching at a national Economics Conference; and a professor of Mathematics to visit a Doctor of Arts program as a possible model at the University of Northern Colorado.

Groups, Departments and Colleges

The Center has continued to respond to requests and needs of interest groups on campus by giving support, providing resources, and leading and organizing workshops. The Center sponsored a half-day workshop for the Department of English, led by Dr. Richard Lloyd-Jones from the University of Iowa who spoke on "The Role of an English Department in a University Setting." Together with the College of Fine Arts, the Center sponsored a visit by Michael Rothenstein as guest artist/lecturer for a week on campus. The Center provided support for a visit by Dr. Robert Heiny from the University of Northern Colorado who advised the Department of Mathematics on their Doctor of Arts program. The Center funded Dr. Thomas Rossing from Northern Illinois University as consultant in preparing a new course for the Physics Department. In most cases the Center provided partial assistance in conjunction with funding from the interested department or college. This ensures a commitment from the interested group and allows the Center to provide the widest possible support with its limited resources.

In cooperation with the Professional Development Center, the Teaching-Learning Center has continued to hold meetings for departmental chairpersons, and meetings this year have included workshops on communication skills, the running of efficient meetings, and effective time management.

The Center's involvement in the improvement of teaching of graduate assistants has continued. Graduate assistants from a number of different academic departments have been involved and now take a course offered in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction with support from the Center.

At the request of the College of Applied Science and Technology, the Center continued its examination of the worth of different teaching evaluation/report forms.

Fifteen faculty members from the College have been involved in this project. With financial assistance from the University's Instructional Development Program, the Center compared the results from four forms--the IDEA, SIRS, TAP, and a College of Applied Science and Technology instrument. The Center has discussed its findings with the College.

The Center has continued to facilitate retreat sessions for individual departments. The Departments of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work; Home Economics; Corrections; Allied Health; Mathematics; Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; English; and Geography-Geology have used the Center services in this way. The Center also sponsored a meeting of the College Council of the College of Arts and Sciences at Ewing Manor.

At the request of the Graduate School, the Teaching-Learning and Professional Development Centers sponsored a Forum in July on the Doctor of Arts programs at Illinois State. Over sixty people attended the meeting and social event which was held at Ewing Manor. A number of Doctor of Arts candidates were present and several presented their reactions to the new D.A. programs.

The Center facilitated a meeting of all teachers of general education courses in the College of Fine Arts to examine ways to address enrollment declines in those courses. The Center has been asked to work with the College for the next year on this problem.

University-Wide Programs and Workshops

The following activities started last year for university-wide faculty use are still in operation: (1) the Teaching Center Newsletter, which is disseminated to over 300 faculty members and which contains short articles on teaching, details of Center activities, book reviews, and bibliographies; (2) the brown bag luncheon meetings, where invited faculty members have spoken on "Use of Computers in Simulation and Research," "Can Higher Education Respond to Change?" "Team Teaching in Interdisciplinary Courses," and "The Uses of the Digitizer;" and (3) the Teaching Laboratory, where faculty can have their teaching videotaped for later analysis.

In January, it was decided to close the faculty lounge which the Center had operated in DeGarmo Hall for a year. The location and the limited availability of the lounge (only two hours a day, 9-11 a.m.) seemed drawbacks to its use by faculty members and the expense of its upkeep appeared unwarranted. The Center continues to pursue building a sense of a teaching community as a major goal; and it seems unfortunate that there is no faculty lounge on campus where faculty can meet to share ideas.

The Center continues to offer campus-wide workshops and seminars on topics related to teaching and learning. The following such workshops have been offered this year: (1) two media workshops, "Introduction to Media Services" and "Teaching with Media: How to Use It and When," in cooperation with Media Services; (2) " Writing Articles about Teaching," a workshop designed to stimulate faculty members to write about their teaching; and (3) two workshops on a process for the selection of textbooks for large, introductory classes, "A Textbook Selection Process."

Evaluation

The Center has begun gathering data on its workshops and conferences and is in the process of finalizing its data gathering approach for the fourth year summative evaluation. One Kellogg Associate has been appointed half-time to coordinate the evaluation process and most of his time (August through December, 1978) has been devoted to (1) gathering and cataloguing appropriate data already available (evaluation sheets from workshops, interviews of past Associates, the Project Director, and a sampling of faculty), (2) matching available data to the Goals, Objectives, Activities, Resources, Evaluation Criteria, and Evaluation Procedures outlined in the Evaluation Document contained in The Second Annual Report to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, and (3) referring findings to the basic conceptual framework of the Center detailed in Appendix C of The First Annual Report to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, "The Teaching-Learning Center Kellogg Associates Planning Meeting, June 24-27, 1976."

As well as the specific evaluation procedures being formulated by the Center staff, a faculty member from the Department of Psychology has completed a study to determine if there is any "ripple effect" on colleagues of faculty members who attended the Small Group Discussion Skills workshops in 1977-78. Over 100 faculty members attending six different workshops were examined in this study. The study, which is included in the Appendix, attempts to determine if faculty who attended these workshops passed on information and/or teaching skills to colleagues who did not attend. Some slight ripple was discovered.

Targeting

In December of 1977 and January of 1978, the Director of the Teaching-Learning Center introduced a new concept to the functions of the Center, referred to as "targeting." A memorandum from Dr. Sharpham to the Kellogg Associates and the Project Director described "targeting" as follows:

> "Quite simply, 'targeting' refers to using most of the T.L.C. resources in several identified departments for a year or longer in a conjoint relationship that involves a commitment to faculty development by the department and the Center. Obviously, the number of departments involved at any one time will be small, for 'targeting' involves an in-depth ongoing program for each department. I have decided that, for the first year, the number of departments targeted by the Center will not exceed three.
>
> "The shift to 'targeting' departments means that the Center will not offer as many university-wide workshops, seminars and support activities. Instead, such workshops, seminars and support activities can now become concentrated to meet the needs of the departments targeted by the Center. We will be working in a much more specific way.
>
> "The reason for the shift of emphasis in the Center's activities at this stage of its four year program is related directly to what has been accomplished in the first two years. The Center has done quite well in

sponsoring workshops and meetings across a wide spectrum of perceived need-areas in teaching and learning at I. S. U. In both years fifteen or more workshop/meetings have been sponsored and in each year over 300 faculty have participated in these meetings. The Center has not become sufficiently involved in specific problem areas of teaching and learning, particularly in the cases of individual faculty. The faculty demand for such involvement has been very low. It is true that the Center has worked in ongoing relationships with a number of individual faculty; but the number is very small indeed. The Center has become a facilitator, an entrepreneur of a type and a general booking agency for groups of faculty across the university.

"I do not plan to withdraw these functions altogether but I do plan to reduce the Center's involvement in such activities over the next two years. The move to 'targeting' certain departments involves a major shift in strategy for the Center and may create some criticism from faculty who have begun to expect it to perform at a university level. I expect this may be true where specific requests for support are denied because of the Center's involvement with the target departments.

"At this point it is appropriate to outline the T. L. C. resources that I have made available to the target departments for these define, in a new way, the function of the Center and the Kellogg Associates. The departments will have access to:

1. Some financial support in terms of travel (particularly payment of registration fees for off-campus meetings) and off-campus consultants.
2. The use of the time and expertise of the Kellogg Associates individually and as a team.
3. The use of the Director and T. L. C. staff.

What this means is that much of the energy and support of the Center will now be directed specifically to the needs of three departments. These departments will have first use of the available resources of the Center.

"At the same time, I have decided that it would be wise to make available to each of the target departments one-quarter time F. T. E. for the appointment of a Kellogg Associate for a year, if such appointment meets the specific needs of the department. These Kellogg Associates would not be playing the role that Associates in the first two years have played. Instead of having university-wide roles and responsibilities the new Associates would be working directly with their departmental concern-areas, acting as liaison personnel between their department and the Center. These Associates would be able to participate in some university-wide

programs sponsored by the Center but their major function would be in working for their department. There would be three quarter-time F.T.E. positions available each year to serve the Center's university-wide functions.

"The appointment of Associates from the target departments would be decided by the department chairperson and the T.L.C. Director with the approval of the Advisory Committee.

"I have discussed 'targeting' with Elmer Van Egmond and he has agreed to work closely with the T.L.C. in this approach, particularly in matters relating to long-range planning and personnel decisions. He has agreed to consider appropriate requests for study-leave from the target departments and to give priority treatment to such requests where they evolve from a departmental faculty development program. In one instance he has already promised support for the coming year.

"The move to targeting does constitute a shift in the model we have been using in evaluating the Center. We are diminishing our role as a center of continuing education for faculty because we have not attracted faculty wanting long-term in-depth involvement. We are now moving to an organizational development model and this is appropriate given the skills and expertise of the Center and the apparent needs of the university.

"This is a good time to make change in the Center for it comes at the midway point in the initial life of the program. Also the change will demonstrate an alternative modus operandi for the Center and will enable comparative judgments to be made about the appropriate functions of such a center in an institution like I.S.U."

Using this model, the Center has centered a great deal of its energies this year on the targeting concept with varying degrees of success. Three departments were identified through discussion with the college deans and department chairpersons as possible areas for such involvement. After several months of negotiation and involvement, the Department of English dropped out of the relationship. At the end of 1978, the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance and the Department of Geography-Geology are working closely with the Center as target departments. Both have a member of their faculty serving as a Kellogg Associate addressing the needs of the Department. The Associate from Geography-Geology is developing a Keller model program for graduate courses in the Department. The Associate from Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance is working as a liaison between the Center and the Department, pinpointing major concern areas and helping develop programs to address these areas.

The relationship between the Center and the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (henceforth referred to as HPERD) is the more highly developed of the two and will be discussed in some detail. The relationship with the other department can be expected to develop along similar lines in the next six months.

The Director met with the Dean and Chairpersons in the College of Applied Science and Technology in December of 1977 to explain targeting and obtain their reaction. Two Chairpersons responded immediately and, after consultation, a decision was made to work closely with HPERD. This is a department of some sixty-seven faculty teaching in four distinct undergraduate areas and an active graduate program. As well as the Chairperson and Assistant Chairperson, there are five Program Directors representing the major areas of the Department. The Department has a very high proportion of tenured faculty in the Physical Education area, which has experienced an enrollment decline in the last few years. In the growth areas of Health Education and Recreation and Park Administration there is a low tenure situation and increasing enrollments. The Dance area has also experienced a slight increase in student enrollments. At the same time a number of Physical Education faculty are returning to the Department from various outside positions such as advising, the laboratory schools, and the Athletics program. These faculty members are tenured and generalist teachers returning to a program that has sufficient faculty in it and whose return as tenured faculty means "bumping" untenured faculty in the growth areas. It was in response to these concerns that the Chairperson sought the assistance of the Teaching-Learning Center. After initial discussion with him, it became clear that involvement of the Professional Development Center's resources would be most useful and very quickly it was determined that targeting would become a total Kellogg Project operation.

From the start the Project has had the full cooperation of the Department Chairperson and this has enabled a great deal to be done in the first year. The Project has been involved in the following targeting activities with HPERD this year: (1) facilitating long-range planning meetings of the Program Directors and Chairperson to determine and confront major decisions for the next five years; (2) facilitating an all-day faculty retreat attended by all faculty to consider the information of the Program Directors' meeting and discuss the implications for the Department for the next five years; (3) meeting with the Chairperson to decide on faculty members for the Educational Leave program and the position of Kellogg Associate; (4) granting of Educational Leave to a faculty member; (5) appointing an HPERD faculty member as a Kellogg Associate; (6) providing financial support for groups of faculty to attend meetings on teaching in St. Louis and in Kansas; (7) facilitating a meeting of the Graduate Faculty of the Department; (8) providing support and assistance for two faculty in preparing articles on teaching; (9) with the Kellogg Associate, developing a Public Relations Advisory Committee for the Department, modifying registration procedures by faculty, distributing "action items" questionnaires, and moving to improve departmental communication links; (10) planning and presenting an in-depth workshop on the use of media in teaching in the Department; (11) arranging videotaping of two faculty and discussion of results with them; and (12) maintaining continued contact with the Chairperson to discuss and consult on problem areas as they arise.

The Project will continue to work closely with both departments in 1979 and may include one more department in its targeting program. The results so far are encouraging.

Dissemination

Although dissemination has not been one of the major goals for this year, the Center continues to share its developing expertise outside the University. The Director has met with representatives from Triton College (River Grove, Illinois), Lincoln Land Community College (Springfield, Illinois), and St. Mary-of-the-Woods College (Terre Haute, Indiana) to discuss the operation of the Center and possible implications for staff development programs on those campuses. The Director discussed the program with faculty from Michigan State University when he visited that campus in January. An article describing a Center-sponsored activity written by a Kellogg Associate was published this year. This article, "In-Service Workshops for Faculty Uses of the Library," by Earl A. Reitan (a former Kellogg Associate) appeared in The Library-College Experimenter, February, 1978. A paper that grew out of a textbook selection process supported by the Center was presented at a national conference in November. The paper, "A Textbook Selection Process," was presented by Dan Prosser (Director, Reading-Study Skills Center) and Robert Culbertson (Chairperson, Department of Corrections) at the Midwest Association of Criminal Justice Educators.

The most significant dissemination activity of the Center was its joint sponsorship of the Staff Development Working Party for the Fourth International Conference on Higher Education, "Post-Compulsory Education in the 1980's," at the University of Lancaster in England on August 29-September 1, 1978. The Center worked together with the Institute for Research and Development in Post-Compulsory Education at the University of Lancaster in planning the working party, inviting papers, in disseminating these prior to the Conference and in running the working party sessions at the Conference. Both the Director and an Associate prepared papers for the Conference. John Sharpham wrote on "Staff in Staff Development" and Dent Rhodes wrote on "Evaluating Staff Development Programs." Both papers are included in the Appendix. Other participants in the working party came from the United States, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway, and Israel. As a follow up to the Conference, the Institute for Research and Development in Post-Compulsory Education and the Teaching-Learning Center have agreed to a joint publication of papers presented in the working party at the Conference. Illinois State's support for the book includes a grant from the ISU Foundation and editorial work by the Center. The book will be published sometime in 1979 for release in the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Director has written a grant proposal to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for a national dissemination conference to be sponsored jointly by the Foundation and ISU. This conference will be held on the ISU campus in October, 1979.

THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER: THE THIRD YEAR

Introduction

The programs and activities of the Professional Development Center have continued to work toward realization of the stated goals. During the third year, the unique contribution of the Educational Leave program has been brought to the attention of a wide audience through the forum of national conferences of selected professional associations. On the University campus, requests for training assistance continue to outstrip the funds made available for this purpose. The Center has also continued to support certain specialized training programs which are short-term and highly specific in nature. The Center has offered and sponsored university-wide workshops and training seminars related to themes of personal-professional and organizational development. A continuing program of individual consultation has been maintained. The third year has brought an increase in coordinated programming produced as a combined effort of the two Centers. A particular example of this trend is provided by "targeting" the combined resources of the Centers to meet a variety of stated needs in specified academic departments. In the following pages, the major activities of the Professional Development Center for the third year of work are presented.

The Educational Leave Program

Although the Kellogg Project is completing its third year of effort, the Educational Leave Program has only been in operation for two years. As was the experience during the first year of the program, requests for assistance came from a broad spectrum of campus units. Although a number of faculty members decided to defer or postpone plans for a training program, formal applications were received from nineteen persons. They represented four of the five colleges of the University, the University Laboratory Schools, and fifteen academic departments. The total funding requested was almost exactly double the amount budgeted for the purpose of supporting educational leaves. From the requests submitted for consideration, a total of nine educational leave plans were approved for support.

During the spring semester, four faculty members were engaged in programs of study to prepare for work in related aspects of their disciplines.

A faculty member who had been devoting a major portion of his teaching efforts to the University High School program worked for a semester at the University of Wisconsin to prepare for a shift in his teaching assignment. Due to a smaller enrollment and a lower level of financial support for the Laboratory Schools, program changes and reduction in staff required that the faculty member assume a full time assignment in the Department of Foreign Languages. A program of formal course work, consultation, and classroom visitation helped prepare for full time work in providing needed offerings in the German language, culture, and pedagogy.

Three members of the faculty directed efforts toward developing expertise relevant to new departmental programs being offered in Early Childhood Education. A member of the Department of Theatre faculty devoted full time to course work and field work at the University of Texas in Austin to develop expertise in the area of Arts in Education. The completion of this work also accomplished meeting requirements

for the Ph. D. degree. In the Department of Mathematics, a member of the faculty devoted one-fourth time to prepare for a new teacher training assignment in mathematics for the special needs child and the pre-school age child. The work entailed the auditing of courses in Early Childhood Education at both Illinois State University and the University of Illinois, visits to several exemplary programs, consultation with effective teachers, and reviews of relevant books and materials. The third faculty member working in this area was from the Department of English. This work was directed to the area of literature for children of pre-school age and was completed, for the most part, at Illinois State University.

Two faculty members were engaged in specialized programs during the summer months. From the Department of Agriculture, a member of the faculty completed a sequence of study begun the previous summer. This series of intensive short courses, offered by the National Safety Council and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), will provide needed expertise for the development of offerings in agricultural accident prevention and examination by the Board of Certified Safety Professionals toward recognition as a Certified Safety Professional. For an eight-week summer period, a member of the English Department was engaged in course work at Brigham Young University's program of Teaching English as a Second Language. This study completed preparation for a Graduate Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language. More importantly, it added to prior summer work supported by the Educational Leave Program which enabled the development of expertise to support departmental programs in Teaching English as a Second Language and linguistics.

For the fall semester, three faculty members committed themselves to a two-semester program of full time study, of which half of the salary support was provided by the Educational Leave Program. In the Department of Specialized Educational Development a faculty member involved in counselor training is supplementing a semester of sabbatical leave with a semester of Educational Leave to work at the University of Colorado to develop expertise for development of an emphasis in Social Ecology as a new and essential component of the Counselor Training sequence. From one of the departments participating in the "targeting" emphasis, a member of the faculty in the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance is devoting a year of time to course work at Sangamon State University and consultation with the leadership and operations personnel at effective program sites for geriatric activity. The focus of this intensive study will be on the needs of senior citizens in the area of the application of physical education programs to the special needs of senior citizens. As a relatively recent need has developed for effective management of programs related to the arts at the community level, a member of the Art Department is combining support from a sabbatical leave and an Educational Leave to develop expertise in management. Spending time and effort at Drexel University, the University of California, Howard University, and the Schomburg Library, this faculty member will prepare for the development of a program in Arts Administration for the department.

In addition to supporting long term programs, the Professional Development Center has also provided support for short-term, specialized training needs. Although the predominant mode of support is for tuition or registration costs, requests for

materials, and travel have also been supported. In most instances funding from the Center supplements monies provided by the faculty member's department, the Instructional Development Program, and out-of-pocket costs by the person concerned. Twenty-one members of the faculty have received support for short-term training programs with a total allocation of a little over three thousand dollars from the Center.

Looking ahead to the third year of the Educational Leave Program, applications for three training-study plans have been approved for the spring semester of the 1978-79 academic year and conversations preliminary to the development of detailed training plans have been held with faculty members considering work during the summer period and the 1979 fall semester. It is already evident that the number of requests to support plans for training will exceed the amount budgeted for this part of the program.

Individual Consultation

The Professional Development Center has continued to provide consultation for faculty members who wish to discuss their present situation and think through plans and options for the future. The formulation of specific training plans for an Educational Leave generate a need to think through one's personal-professional career path. It requires an understanding of departmental and college plans for the future and an assessment of the viability of change plans in the light of present and predicted program needs.

With increasing frequency, the Center is responding to needs for counseling, career planning, and information resources for faculty members who are not awarded tenure status. Notification of non-continuation, whether to faculty members in tenured lines or on temporary status, often provokes a crisis or panic reaction. In such instances the Center can be seen as a neutral agency in the University. This makes it possible to be of assistance in helping the person come to terms with feelings and reactions provoked by the situation and begin to determine their options for the future. A number of individuals come to the Center seeking assistance in preparing or revising their resume statements. Some people wish to obtain consultation on developing a job search strategy or locating sources of information regarding certain career fields. Others wish to explore career options which they may wish to consider for some future point in their lives.

The Center has also provided an opportunity for faculty members and chairpersons to "think out loud" and test out some of their ideas, problem formulations, and future plans.

General Program Activities

A number of programs were presented for different constituencies on the campus throughout the year. In February, a "Life Work Planning" workshop, cosponsored with the Campus Religious Center, was offered for interested members of the faculty and staff. A group of fourteen people, including three couples, worked intensively for a weekend looking at significant aspects of past and recent life experiences as they planned their futures.

A series of programs, jointly sponsored with the Teaching-Learning Center, has continued to be offered for chairpersons and general administrative staff. Session topics included Interpersonal Communication Skills, Improving the Effectiveness of Meetings, Time Management, and Improving Boss-Secretary Teamwork.

In cooperation with the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance and the Illinois Heart Association, the Center made available cardiopulmonary respiration training sessions for all interested members of the University staff and their spouses. During the three evenings that the program was offered, approximately one hundred persons participated in the four-hour training periods.

Working with the Graduate School and the Teaching-Learning Center, a meeting of graduate students and faculty members in the Doctor of Arts program was arranged. The meeting provided opportunity for faculty members and graduate students to present their views of the program and to consider future directions for this relatively new degree program. A social hour following the formal part of the meeting offered an enjoyable opportunity for students and faculty members from different parts of the program to meet and share information and viewpoints.

The Director worked on another aspect of the Doctor of Arts program with the Dean of the Graduate School and directors of the program in the Departments of History and English. Responding to a need expressed by faculty members, a two-week intensive course will be scheduled immediately following the end of the spring semester. The course will focus on the design of program and curriculum evaluation studies and the application of quantitative and statistical measures. This will initiate an in-service training program to enable faculty members supervising dissertation studies to provide more knowledgeable guidance and consultation to their graduate students.

The Director has held a number of consultations with faculty members and administrators to explore the need for a general program of information and instruction to assist members of the faculty in adapting classroom work to meet the special needs of handicapped learners.

During the spring semester, a small sample of faculty members who were new to Illinois State University were interviewed to determine their experiences in becoming oriented to the University and their departmental setting. The responses indicated a wide variation in the amount, type, and timing of information and assistance provided. A follow-up study with a larger sample of faculty members new to the University will be completed and the findings shared with the Provost, the college deans and relevant department chairpersons.

The Director has worked closely with the Teaching-Learning Center in "targeting" Kellogg Project resources to meet the needs of selected departments. During the spring semester, the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (HPERD) made a commitment to work intensively with the two Centers in efforts to more clearly understand and approach resolution of program and staffing issues. Since the report of the Teaching-Learning Center includes a complete description of work with the Department of HPERD, this report will focus on the contributions of the Professional Development Center. The concerns of the Department Chairperson and the five directors of major program areas centered on staffing needs, recognizing

a surplus of tenured faculty skills in one program area and a serious deficit in two other growing program areas. This imbalance was to become more severe under conditions of a budget restriction providing no new positions to supply additional staff for growing program areas and the projected return of two tenured faculty members from other positions on campus.

Involvement with the Department has included consultation with the Chairperson, working with the Program Directors and Chairperson to develop a five-year planning program, planning and assisting in conducting an all-day meeting with departmental faculty to review program requirements, future plans, and staffing needs. Follow-up activities have included recommendations for faculty training plans under the Educational Leave Program and appointment of a faculty member of the Department as a Kellogg Associate. The Project has supported the Associate's initiatives in programming for the Department, provided financial support and other assistance for professional involvement of faculty members, and continued consultation and planning work with the Chairperson.

Dissemination Activities

The program of the Professional Development Center and the Kellogg Project have been presented to several audiences at national conferences of professional associations.

In March, a display and literature table was visited by a large number of educators at the "Idea Marketplace" during the National Conference of the American Association for Higher Education in Chicago. This event provided opportunity for the Director to respond to a great many questions and to distribute copies of Project documents.

At national meetings of the Association for Innovation in Higher Education, held in conjunction with the AAHE conference, the work of the Professional Development Center was described in a presentation titled "Working with Faculty Involved in Disciplinary Reassignments" as an aspect of the more general session topic "New Approaches to Faculty Development: Making More Effective Use of Faculty Resources."

In June, the Director participated in a program on "Human Resource Development Programs in Educational Institutions" with a presentation on the topic "Career Expansion Within the University." The program was sponsored by the Educational Institution Interest Group for the National Conference of the American Society for Training and Development meeting in Chicago.

An opportunity to discuss the program of the Professional Development Center was provided at the National Conference of Employee Assistance Programs in Higher Education held in Kansas City during late summer. A number of Project materials were provided for participants and conversations with interested individuals allowed a more in-depth consideration of specific concerns.

The work of the Kellogg Project was described in two separate program events at the National Conference of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education meeting in November at a conference site near Tulsa. The Director presented a paper on the topic "Faculty Training for Mid-Career Change." At the same conference, he also participated with John Sharpham, Director of the Teaching-

Learning Center, and Stanley Rives, Project Director and Associate Provost, in a session on "Targeting Departments for Faculty Development."

Additional opportunities to distribute publications and to describe the program of the Professional Development Center and the Kellogg Project were afforded by the Director's attendance at other professional meetings. These included a national conference on Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, a seminar on Role Analysis in Organizations, a workshop on organizing and developing Pre-Retirement Programs, and a conference on Faculty Evaluation and Development.

During the year, the Director met with representatives from Triton College to discuss the applicability of the Center's program to their concerns and needs. The Director also spent a day at Drake University and at DePauw University meeting with their administrative staff and departmental chairpersons.

As in previous years, the significant professional activities of the Director and programs sponsored by the Center are described in the weekly publication of the University's News and Publications Office, the Illinois State Report. Information is continually being provided to various parts of the University community through consultation with individuals, presentations and discussion with various constituencies, and circulation of announcements of program offerings.

Case Study of an Educational Leave

Quite some time before student interests shifted to other disciplines and departmental majors began to decline, it was not conceivable that a person teaching courses in literature and writing would be concerned about such a thing as excess staff competence in this particular area of expertise. It was not a pleasant thing to contemplate. The facts, however, were quite clear. Enrollment in the University was remaining quite stable, enrollment in the Department of English had declined considerably and the number of majors had slipped even more rapidly! Coupled with the demographic predictions of reduced freshman enrollment in the next few years, the future prospects for traditional curricular programs were not very encouraging.

The general trends of University enrollment, birthrate decline, and shifting student enrollment patterns have limited personal impact, however, until an individual is either specifically affected by these factors or becomes personally engaged in dealing with the implications of the data. In this particular instance, the individual had been a member of the Illinois State University Department of English faculty since 1963, held rank as an assistant professor in the Department, and had been awarded tenure. As fewer students were signing up for literature courses, it became evident that an overstaffing situation was beginning to develop. From a personal-professional point of view, the prospects for viable career development and progression did not look encouraging. For a person in their mid-forties, without a terminal degree and facing declining demand for one's area of expertise, prospects for promotion and a satisfactory future professional experience were indeed dim.

With these facts in hand, the Department Chairperson and the faculty member had held some conversations regarding the developing consequences of enrollment changes and plans for meeting new program needs. Since budget restrictions required that new programs be staffed from existing positions, new programs in such areas as

early childhood education, bilingual instruction, and teaching English as a second language would require some members of the Department to undertake a program of preparation to meet these developing needs.

As an instance of fortuitous timing, the Professional Development Center of the Kellogg Project was activited on March 1, 1976. A few weeks later, the Chairperson of the English Department made contact with the Director to explore the applicability of the Center's program in meeting faculty training needs. A meeting of the Chairperson, faculty member, and the Director was held to consider departmental plans and staffing requirements, the interest and needs of the faculty member concerned, and to clarify the role and procedures of the Educational Leave Program. There followed a series of conversations between the faculty member and the Director in which plans for future career directions were considered along with a program of preparation to develop expertise in linguistics and teaching English as a second language. The resulting Educational Leave Plan specified a series of course work, independent study, and consultations which would meet several objectives: (1) develop additional background and competence in linguistics, (2) prepare for assignments in a proposed bilingual program, (3) provide needed staff expertise for a proposed program in teaching English to students who speak other languages, and (4) reactivate a doctoral studies program and completing basic course work requirements for the degree.

Although the Educational Leave Program of the Professional Development Center was not scheduled to begin until January, 1977, the urgency of the situation and the amount of planning work which had been completed provided the impetus to obtain budget allocation and approval for work to begin during the summer months of 1976. Since the initial period of support, the Professional Development Center has provided salary support for additional study during summer periods in 1977 and 1978.

At this point in time, what benefit has accrued to the faculty member, the Department, and the University? Following the first summer of Educational Leave, the faculty member taught one section of a course specifically offered for students who were seeking to improve their skills in English as a second language and a course in traditional and non-traditional grammar. A further application of expertise developed during the summer work was reflected in helping to establish and conduct a language testing program for students who are speakers of other languages.

The immediacy of return from the faculty member's summer study in linguistics and TESL was renewing and gratifying to the faculty member concerned and provided welcome and needed instructional resources as well as a measure of relief from excess staff capacity in literature. The continuation of the planned program of study has enabled the faculty member to meet the requirements for a graduate certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language and to complete essential course work and residency requirements for the doctorate. The increased competency acquired in the areas of linguistics and TESL have benefited the Department in course offerings in grammar and English for students who speak other languages. The department and college have benefited from the skills and knowledge applied in the bilingual

testing program and in a testing program for new foreign students coming to our campus. The provision of this additional expertise on the departmental faculty provided essential support for a proposed Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages minor in the English Department. The University has also benefited in enabling the International Studies Office to arrange programs for students from foreign countries to study on the ISU campus with the provision of essential assistance in developing skills in the use of the English language.

This case study presents a picture which is neither typical nor unique with respect to the faculty members who have participated in the Educational Leave Program during the two years of its work. It does provide an indication of how human resources can be reallocated with a rather small investment of money. It does not suggest that problems of large-scale overstaffing or obsolescence can be quickly turned around. It does demonstrate that, with careful planning which takes into consideration the professional interests and career progression of the person and the changing needs of the department and the institution, a renewal and revitalization of the faculty member and an instructional sequence can occur.

APPENDIX

DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Professional Development and Teaching-Learning Centers at Illinois State University

Stanley G. Rives

Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities, John Centra's Exxon Foundation-supported research study published by Educational Testing Service, reveals that "perhaps half or slightly more than half of the postsecondary institutions in the United States currently provide some sort of program or set of development activities for faculty."[1] The focus of this developmental activity is to help faculty members grow in teaching effectiveness by sharpening their teaching skills and knowledge, to help faculty better understand themselves and their institutions, or to foster better environments for teaching and learning. Declining faculty mobility and a general disenchantment with the quality of college instruction are identified as major reasons for the recent thrust in faculty development activity.

There are perhaps three landmark pieces of literature on the subject: a 1971 AAUP study by Kenneth Eble, Career Development of the Effective College Teacher[2]; a 1974 Change publication, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment by the Group for Human Development in Higher Education[3]; and a 1975 survey and classification, Toward Faculty Renewal by Jerry Gaff.[4]

If an essential function of academic administration is understood to be facilitating the teaching-learning process, then knowledge about national developments and concern with establishment of an effective campus faculty and instructional development program become crucial. The purposes here are to describe the evolution of a campus program, take note of recent national findings, identify issues for the immediate future of faculty-instructional development activity, and explore the issue of evaluation in the context of one such program.

Evolution of A Campus Program. Illinois State University initiated a modest Faculty Development Program (FDP) in 1969-70. With $50,000 in support from indirect cost funds, a faculty committee was established to draft guidelines, solicit and evaluate proposals from the faculty, and support the best of these. The $50,000 was expended easily the first year--more good projects were proposed than could be funded. The faculty committee took its job seriously and reached two conclusions as a result of evaluating the first year's experience: First, the focus of proposals should be more upon direct payoff in classroom instruction. Second, the program met a real faculty need and should therefore be continued. The program, later renamed the Instructional Development Program (IDP) has continued since 1969, making direct grants to faculty members on a faculty committee-evaluated, funded-proposal basis. Over the years, about half of the proposals submitted have been funded. Budget support provided has included student help, contractual services, commodities, printing, and computer services, but not faculty time. Since the beginning, faculty who have received FDP or IDP grants have submitted narrative and evaluative reports upon completion of their projects. These reports are published yearly.[5]

Two faculty reactions to this program have resulted in significant subsequent program modifications. A first reaction was that, while a direct grant program to faculty for improvement of teaching was worthwhile, the program lacked incentives for more long-range, in-depth curriculum reform. This, said the faculty committee, would require providing employment time, during the summer if possible, for individual faculty or groups of faculty to concentrate effort on curriculum work toward development of new academic programs or significant improvement of existing programs. Thus, a Summer Instructional Development Program was inaugurated, again operating on a faculty-committee-reviewed, approved-proposal basis. The Summer IDP program currently operates on a budget of $90,000, which will provide a month's summer employment for about 45 faculty members. It is a counterpart to the campus Summer Research grant program, which has a still larger budget.

A second and subsequent faculty reaction to the IDP program led to a much more significant expansion of the program. Regular year and Summer IDP grants to improve instruction, said the faculty, still leave a significant gap in a total faculty development effort. A comprehensive program, many felt, would require staff assistance being made available for work with faculty on improving teaching effectiveness and on the professional development of teaching faculty. The magnitude of the task and resources which would be required to implement it effectively led the University to seek external support from a foundation for expansion of the program effort. With substantial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the University was successful in establishing what has come to be known as the Kellogg Project, a faculty and instructional development program designed to provide opportunities for revitalization of instruction in an era of stable or declining enrollments in higher education. The ISU Kellogg Project includes both a Teaching-Learning Center to assist faculty members who desire to improve their teaching effectiveness and a Professional Development Center to deal with faculty adjustment and training needs created by shifting student enrollment patterns and reallocation. The Project has an initial four-year life span with funding as follows:

	Kellogg Funds	University Funds	Total Costs
1976	$ 96,500	$ 8,500	$105,000
1977	111,683	46,152	157,835
1978	93,845	103,215	197,060
1979	60,771	177,149	237,920
Totals	$362,799	$335,016	$697,815

The Project is designed to phase-in state appropriations so that, provided it is successful, total support will be transferred from the Kellogg Foundation funds to regular University funds by the fifth year of operation. The first two years of the Project have been completed, with results described in a First Annual Report, 1976[6] and a Second Annual Report, 1977[7] to the Kellogg Foundation. Copies of these Reports are available to interested persons.

Thus, from a modest beginning in 1969 and a $50,000 faculty development grant program, the University has gradually structured a fairly comprehensive faculty and instructional development program. Such a comprehensive program requires a significant investment of resources. In calendar 1977, for example, Illinois State University and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation expended about $250,000 in support of the total program.

A National Perspective. While it is tempting to describe this campus program in greater detail, it is more useful to explore the national experience, and John Centra's research findings are particularly relevant here. The following are some of his major findings:[8]

1. Among the most effective institution-wide practices are summer grants for projects to improve instruction, sabbatical leaves, and professional travel funds or grants. Interestingly, the latter two traditional practices are now being curtailed by many institutions because of tight budgets.

2. Though awards to faculty for teaching excellence are widely used at universities (79 percent of universities make such awards), they are not rated as effective in improving instruction (only 27 percent described them as "effective" or "very effective"). The circulation of newsletters and articles pertaining to teaching are also rated as fairly ineffective devices.

3. Systematic ratings by students to help faculty improve instruction, though widely used, are perceived as only moderately effective, perhaps because teachers receive little interpretation of results, because instructors with poor ratings are unsure of what to do about them, and because teaching improvement is not always the sole purpose of collecting the ratings.

4. Grants to faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses and teaching are both highly rated and extensively used, with about 90 percent of the universities and only slightly fewer of the two and four-year colleges now having faculty grant programs.

5. The most active participants in faculty development programs are "good teachers who want to get better," and teachers most needing improvement are only minimally involved. Not unexpectedly, university faculty who are evaluated largely on the basis of their publication records are less likely to participate in faculty development activities aimed at improving their performance as teachers.

6. Respondents rated formal or informal assessments by colleagues as less effective than either consulting with faculty who have expertise or working with "master teachers." Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction is seen as one of the more effective practices.

7. Faculty workshops and seminars, if planned in response to the expressed needs of faculty members, are seen as generally effective, particularly those dealing with specific techniques of instruction and with new knowledge in the field. Faculty are much interested in workshops on evaluation of student performance and on applications of instructional technology to teaching. College workshops are more likely to deal with topics like institutional purposes or academic advisement of students, while university seminars are more likely to concern testing or development of research and scholarship skills.

8. About half of higher education institutions (but two-thirds of universities) report they now have units or persons that coordinate faculty development activities on their campuses. Most of these units are new, having a median existence of 2.3 years. Seventy percent of their budgets are from institutional funds, with most of the rest coming from foundation or government grants.

9. Several practices are identified as effective, but little used, including the use of professional and personal development plans for individual faculty members (growth contracts, that is), and use of instructional development specialists to diagnose teaching following classroom visits and assist faculty in course development.

10. Only 14 percent of the institutions reported that they had evaluated their faculty development program activities.

There are other findings of the research survey, but these appear to be the most relevant. The findings also largely conform with faculty and instructional development program experience at Illinois State University.

Issue Identification. Combining local experience with the national survey allows identification of four major issues which will face faculty and instructional development programs in the immediate future.

A first issue: Are the right faculty involved? We know that a large number of faculty have become involved. We also know that good teachers who want to get better are most involved while those most needing improvement are least involved. Centra's observations parallel our own experience precisely: "Good teachers who want to get better comprise the major clientele. After all, they are frequently the most interested in teaching. They may also be the best group to involve in developmental activities in the initial stages of a program so it does not get a reputation as largely a clinic for deficient teachers. There is probably no better way to drive faculty away from a program than to identify it as a service for the inadequate."[9] But suppose--purely hypothetically, of course--an institution has a barely adequate teacher with tenure. What then? Can we begin to identify ways to involve those persons most needing faculty development services?

A second, closely related issue: Can we begin to tie faculty and instructional development activity participation more closely into the reward structure? It seldom is now. Might this be accomplished by asking faculty members to submit accounts of their development activities each year and considering these in the total evaluations of individuals? Can receiving a faculty or instructional development grant be considered equally important with receiving a research grant? Can research and writing on the teaching process be stimulated and rewarded in the same fashion as more traditional scholarly publication?

A third issue: Can we increase involvement in and the range of faculty development activities? Are we willing to utilize surveys of our own faculties so as to create programs tailored to the needs and interests of a particular faculty? Are we willing to utilize faculty development advisory committees to keep programs cognizant of and responsive to faculty opinion? We know that teaching improvement grants work; faculty who receive such grants are pleased and some good changes result. Shall we be

content with this "innovation"--which is fast becoming a traditional practice--or shall we expand developmental activity to more risky business such as creating growth contracts with faculty members, such as providing educational leaves for the purpose of "retooling" faculty who find themselves in low-demand areas to teach in areas of higher demand, such as getting rid of ineffective annual teaching awards and finding ways to utilize student evaluation of teaching toward improvement of instruction rather than a convenient measure of annual salary determination?

A final issue: Should a faculty-instructional development unit become an established part of the structure of a college or university, a permanent service to faculty? That is happening whether we think it should or not, and, unfortunately, it is happening on the basis of shabby evidence. There is no more significant national finding, in my judgment, than that only 14 percent of faculty development activities have been evaluated, a fact that does not become the American higher education administrative establishment. Are we willing to do something about that, to continue to sustain faculty development programs or not on a basis of demonstrated impact on the quality of instruction provided by our institutions? If we are not willing to do so, faculty development activity may prove but another passing fad.

Evaluation of a Program. When the ISU Kellogg Project was created, it was agreed that a comprehensive approach to evaluation of the program would be designed during the second year of operation (1977) and that the evaluation itself would be carried out during the fourth year of operation (1979). "Evaluation of the Kellogg Project, Illinois State University" by Stanley G. Rives (Project Director), John R. Sharpham (Director, Teaching-Learning Center), and Elmer E. Van Egmond (Director, Professional Development Center) describes the fourth-year evaluation process. Basic purposes of the evaluation are (1) to determine the effectiveness of the Project and its component Centers, (2) to determine, on the basis of this assessment, whether the Project should be institutionalized or discontinued, and (3) to determine what has been learned about faculty and instructional development at ISU which may be of value to similar institutions of higher education. The evaluation document was created with the assistance of two external consultants--Dr. Paul Dressel of Michigan State University and Dr. Royce Knapp of the University of Nebraska. Matters covered in the document include:

1. Introduction. A brief description of the Project, personnel involved in structuring the evaluation, and a discussion of formative-summative and immediate-long-range aspects of the evaluation.

2. Approach to Evaluation. An overview of the evaluation process including (a) statement and clarification of goals of the TLC and PDC, (b) identification of activities and resources related to goals, (c) statement of evaluation criteria, identification of means of assessment, and assessment of programs against these criteria and data, and (d) implications for the University and other institutions of higher education.

3. Illinois State University as Context for the Project. A discussion of broad and specific University goals and institutional problems (student enrollment, financial support, faculty staffing and morale) as a context for operation of the TLC and PDC.

4. Professional Development Center. An identification of five specific goals of the PDC. Objectives, activities, resources, and evaluation criteria and methods are listed for each of these five goals. The five goals are (a) to establish a Center which provides services and support for faculty members in professional development, (b) to develop and provide programs to help faculty members prepare for new or different professional responsibilities which meet individual or institutional needs or both, (c) to develop procedures which support effective utilization of existing faculty resources, (d) to disseminate acquired knowledge and generate new knowledge about faculty development, and (e) to develop a Center which can serve as a model faculty resource center for adoption or adaptation by other institutions.

5. Teaching-Learning Center. An identification of seven specific goals, with objectives, activities, resources, evaluation criteria, and measurement/evaluation procedures listed for each goal. The seven goals are (a) to develop and maintain a TLC central to faculty involvement in the teaching-learning process by being a catalyst and support, (b) to help provide a climate that will support the development of the best possible instructional program for faculty and students, (c) to encourage and facilitate open discussion among faculty about aspects of their teaching and to make this ongoing communication central to building a sense of community, (d) to support and facilitate an increase in writing and research about the teaching-learning process, (e) to provide faculty with support and assistance in all areas of their teaching (e.g., planning long-range educational goals, alternative classroom approaches, strategies, and evaluation), (f) to develop a resource center with a multitude of instructional materials and resources designed by faculty for faculty use, and (g) to create a center that can be used as a model by other institutions for operating resource centers in teaching-learning for their faculty.

6. Impact of the Project on ISU. An identification of questions central to the institutional impact of the Project, including impact on faculty, students, educational program, and institutional viability.

7. Organizational and Financial Considerations. A discussion of (a) approaching the most effective organizational structure for conduct of faculty and instructional development programs, and (b) securing continuing financial support of the Project in total evaluation of the program.

8. Summary. A summary of the evaluation design and discussion of plans for dissemination after the fourth year evaluation is complete.

Supporting detail, including the evaluation document described here, is available in the 1977 Second Annual Report on the Illinois State University Kellogg Project referenced earlier. It is only through intensive evaluation efforts as projected for the ISU Kellogg Project that meaningful decisions on utility and permanence are possible.

FOOTNOTES

Stanley G. Rives is Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction, Professor of Information Sciences, and Project Director for the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Faculty and Instructional Development Program at Illinois State University.

1 John A. Centra, Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, November, 1976), p. 6.

2 Kenneth E. Eble, Career Development of the Effective College Teacher (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, November, 1971). A result of the AAUP's Project to Improve College Teaching. Eble's Professors as Teachers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972) and The Craft of Teaching: A Guide to Mastering the Professors' Art (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976) are also relevant.

3 Group for Human Development in Higher Education, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1974). A fundamental rationale is provided for faculty development activity in colleges and universities.

4 Jerry G. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975). A now dated survey of types of faculty, instructional, and organizational development activities in American postsecondary institutions.

5 Brief descriptions of the instructional development projects completed by faculty are available in Innovation at Illinois State University, 1972-73, Instructional Development at Illinois State University, 1973-74, Instructional Development at Illinois State University, 1974-75, and Instructional Development at Illinois State University, 1975-76. The 1972-73 report also contains a report on 35 Educational Innovation projects completed that year with the aid of a $566,000 grant.

6 Illinois State University Kellogg Project, Professional Development Center, Teaching-Learning Center: First Annual Report, 1976. The Report includes the original proposal to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, progress reports on implementation of the TLC and PDC, and materials developed in the initial year.

7 Illinois State University Kellogg Project, Professional Development Center, Teaching-Learning Center: Second Annual Report, 1977. The Report provides a comprehensive description of the evaluation process to be employed during the fourth year of the Project and brief summaries of PDC and TLC activities during the second year of operation.

8 The ten findings are abstracted from Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities by John Centra. The brief summarization does some violence to Centra's findings, and the reader is encouraged to consult the total 88 page report, which may be obtained for $2 from Centra at Educational Testing Service.

9 Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities, p. 59.

University of Lancaster
4th International Conference
on Higher Education
29 August - 1 September 1978

Working Party on
"Staff Development"

STAFF IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

By
John R. Sharpham
Director
Teaching-Learning Center
Illinois State University

Abstract

The sudden increase in staff development programs in the United States over the last five years has created a demand for personnel for such programs. There are not enough well-qualified, expert individuals to meet this demand and, in some cases, teaching staff have become directly involved as the personnel of the programs.

This paper examines the advantages and disadvantages of having non-experts staff a faculty development program and uses as a specific case the Teaching-Learning Center at Illinois State University. This program uses members of the teaching staff who work for the Center on a part-time basis, usually serving for an academic year. Since 1976, fourteen persons have served as staff of the Center, coming from each of the five colleges on campus.

There are a number of advantages in having non-experts involved directly in running the program. These advantages relate more directly to operating such a program in an atmosphere of tension, uncertainty and retrenchment than they do with supplying expert knowledge and research about teaching improvement. The disadvantages may lie in not having sufficient expertise and in not having a clear point of focus or one, definite area of expertise.

Introduction

The growth in faculty development in the United States in colleges and universities over the last five years has added a new group of experts to the field of education; or perhaps it is more accurate to say that it has underlined the existence of these experts or specialists. These people are specialist professionals in higher education who are concerned primarily with improving teaching on college and university campuses. They are teachers of teachers but in a particular and peculiar way. They function not so much as members of a college of education might in preparing future teachers for a teaching career, but rather as specialists in a college of continuing education might, offering extension courses (or more accurately, extension experiences) for teachers in the field. In most cases their clients, the teachers on campus, do not always see the need to be involved in these experiences.

If the term faculty development is not new, the emphasis on it as a field (it cannot yet be called a discipline) certainly is and there are very few real professionals specializing in the field. As Gaff has pointed out, ". . . .there are few persons who are competent by virtue of their training and experience to help their faculty colleagues improve the quality of their teaching."[1] There are people who have concentrated on one aspect of development in higher education, on a teaching strategy such as self-paced instruction or computer assisted instruction, or on the evaluation of teaching using student reports, or on aspects of student learning, or on university administration and organization. Of these specialists, very few have worked specifically and over a period of time on the improvement of teaching of faculty at colleges and universities. This has led one writer to conclude: "Just as there are not enough faculty well trained as teachers, so there are not as many consultants as are needed to assist in the necessary training and pedagogical support of teachers."[2]

The growth in faculty development programs across the United States has created a need for people to lead the programs and, with so few professionals, a significant question is raised as to who is to staff such programs. Several publications on faculty development, significant because they were among the first to appear in the U.S. as the movement began and therefore influential, suggest using faculty for faculty development purposes. The Change publication, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment, states that any group of faculty contain within themselves the ingredients necessary for a successful program: "Given persistent leadership, members of any faculty can go a long way in helping themselves by drawing on their varied experience in teaching, raising questions about particular cases, observing the process of education more clearly as a result, trying new methods and helping one another evaluate the outcomes."[3] Gaff points out that most institutions have people with some expertise relevant to faculty development. "There are," he says, "several persons on most campuses, not all of them very visible, who have such experience that can be utilized in instructional improvement programs."[4]

These people are not specialists, but can be used when a need arises for their particular expertise. The Change publication goes a step further, however, suggesting faculty take responsibility for faculty development. "Whatever use is made of consultants or a professional staff, the responsibility for making the program work should rest with members of the faculty--some of whom, as associates, would devote part of their regular teaching time to the work of the institute."[5]

Involving faculty in this way raises questions as to how they might be used and how effective they might be in working in a faculty development program. This paper will address itself to these questions by examining one program that actively uses faculty. The program will be described, its strengths and weaknesses examined and conclusions will be drawn about using faculty in this way. The program to be used as a model is the Teaching-Learning Center at Illinois State University.

The Center, which has been in operation since January, 1976, is part of the Kellogg Project, a faculty development program on campus, co-sponsored for four years by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the University. The Center has a full time director, a staff of Kellogg Associates, a secretary and student help support.

There are 1200 faculty at Illinois State University serving 20,000 students. The Associates are drawn from the faculty and are appointed to the Center for at least one year. The Center has six quarter-time positions available for the Associates, the quarter-time being judged as a quarter of the regular teaching load. The positions actually provide the equivalent of one and one-half faculty positions for the Center. At the same time, the positions are on a released-time basis, enabling the departments to be reimbursed fully for the release of a faculty member to serve as an Associate with the Center.

In the first three years, the Associates have come from each of the five colleges on campus (Arts and Sciences, Education, Applied Science and Technology, Fine Arts and Business). In the first year, two held half-time appointments, two held quarter-time appointments; in the second and third years, one half-time position was used and the other positions were quarter-time. The use of Associates in this part-time way inevitably means that they are teaching within their own departments or discipline areas while they serve as Kellogg Associates. In all cases but one, these areas have not related directly to the improvement of teaching in higher education. The Associates have come from the Departments of Accounting; Industrial Technology; History; Home Economics; English; Sociology; Business Education; Music; Special Education; Geography-Geology; Psychology; Curriculum and Instruction; and Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. Only one of these Associates is a specialist in faculty development.

The Associates have been central to the functioning of the Teaching-Learning Center from the beginning. In the original proposal to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, their function was tied closely to the whole operation. This is reflected in the three primary responsibilities of the director described for operating the Center. He was to:

> ". . .(1) provide appropriate consultation and experiences for faculty members who desire the services of the Center to improve instruction; (2) identify qualified senior faculty members who can serve as "mentors" to work with faculty members who seek Center services; and (3) provide instructional improvement workshops and clinics utilizing off-campus consultants and on-campus personnel dealing with specific instructional problem areas."[6]

The use of the word "mentor" clearly identifies the kind of role expected of the Associate and the type of person he or she would be. The following criteria were used for the selection of the Associates for the first year:

> "(1) The Associates should be interested in, enthusiastic about and involved in effective teaching at Illinois State University; (2) They must have the ability to assist in the development of a conceptual basis for operating the Center which would set it in the context of the University and provide a basis for ongoing evaluation of Center activities; (3) At least one of the Associates would need to be a person who had been associated with the institution and faculty for some time, who understood the rapid growth changes of the institution over the last ten to fifteen years, and who had demonstrated leadership in innovative teaching during this period; (4) One Associate would need to be sensitive to faculty needs and able to assist faculty in developing self-evaluation techniques for teaching and teaching objectives; (5) At least one of the Associates would need to understand the technological support systems well, and be able to help the rest of the staff, as well as the faculty, see the potential of such resources for effective teaching; (6) All would need to be persons who would be willing to work together as a team, sharing and cooperating in a new, and many ways unknown, venture...."[7]

These criteria have been modified slightly in the last two years though, substantially, the criteria remain the same. An Associate must have a public commitment to effective teaching, have demonstrated excellence in teaching, must be a willing team member and must be able to communicate well with his colleagues. In the third year, two Associates were chosen to work more specifically in meeting teaching needs within their departments. In their case, commitment to these department needs was judged to be of first importance; a public commitment, which might involve them working with the general university faculty, was judged to be secondary.

It is clear that selection of the Associates is not determined by their expertise in faculty development. In the first year, only one member of the staff had such expertise. Other criteria are deemed to be important, particularly criteria relating to the context of the program within the university setting.

The Associates perform a number of different functions for the program. A significant ongoing contribution they make is to the planning of the operation. They have been responsible, with the director, for establishing long-range goals and objectives for the Teaching-Learning Center, for developing a conceptual basis for its operation and for writing a comprehensive evaluation document on its operation. They have been involved in planning and facilitating over forty workshops for the faculty on teaching strategies, long-term planning, curriculum development, the evaluation of teaching and developing a sense of a teaching community. They have worked with individual faculty members on problem areas in teaching and interviewed a number of faculty about teaching. Each Associate has also pursued some area of particular interest to him or her that related to teaching, e.g., a History professor organized a series of workshops on using the library as a teaching resource; a Sociology professor who had developed a specific approach to teaching large groups ran a workshop on large group instruction.

Associates have attended meetings and workshops about faculty development off-campus and several have given papers about their work with the Center. Over 500 faculty have participated in activities sponsored by the Center or received direct assistance from Center staff. These figures reflect the energy and drive of the staff in involving members of the faculty in Center activities and do underline the commitment the staff have given to the Center.

Advantages and Disadvantages

Using faculty in the development program, acknowledging that they are not specialists in faculty development, does provide a number of advantages. The Teaching-Learning Center immediately is involved with people who are performing the usual faculty roles within the University, teaching, writing, research, committee work, student advising and the like. It is being run by colleagues who are known to members of the faculty in roles other than the improvement of teaching. They are not seen to be experts in teaching nor seen as administrators; and, in the present climate of many institutions in the U.S., this is important. As teaching is tied so closely to professional status--in many places, teaching is evaluated to determine decisions on promotion, tenure and salary--any program that works to improve teaching is vulnerable. The more autonomous it is and the closer it is to the faculty, the better is its chance for success. In such a climate there is a distinct advantage in having a program that involves faculty at the colleague level.

In the first year of the Teaching-Learning Center, many rumors circulated about its purpose. There were fears that it was a new arm of the administration to punish poor teaching or that it would single out and name poor teachers on campus. Some chairpersons saw it initally as a place to which bad teachers could be referred. Some faculty resented the notion that they might need help with their teaching. There was a general negative feeling about its purpose and function. The appointment of the Kellogg Associates helped dispel some of the fears, for the Associates lent their credibility as faculty members to the center. There was an immediate faculty stake in its operation and possible future directions.

There may be another advantage in not having acknowledged experts in a program; many faculty believe themselves to be already good to very good teachers. The formation of a teaching improvement program may seem to suggest that faculty need improving because they are inferior teachers and that, plus the general academic antipathy for anything expert, may isolate the program. Working with colleagues allows possibilities for change to be explored rather than solutions to be imposed and does not involve the threat that using an expert might.

There is, of course, a concomitant disadvantage that not being experts in faculty development the Associates may not satisfy the demands of the faculty who request expert advice. At Illinois State University the use of Associates has been generally acceptable to the faculty. Experts have been called in from outside the University through the Center, but the more constant demand has not been for expert assistance so much as it has been for discussion with and advice from colleagues. After such discussion and advice, specific expert help may be sought and is provided through the Center, using, as a rule, experts from outside the university.

Another advantage in using faculty members in a faculty development program is that they know the institution and can respond to its particular structure and operation. Teaching is such a sensitive issue in most institutions of higher education that any discussion of it beyond a most general level is fraught with difficulty and, if not danger, then certainly tension. A knowledge of this tension in the different areas of the university is very important, for in its initial stages particularly, a teaching improvement program has little margin for failure--one blunder may well close its doors. A staff drawn from across campus provides a good barometer for responses to any planned activities and for pinpointing future actions. A cross section of the staff knowledgeable about this past and demonstrably dedicated to the institution's future because of past involvements can lend credibility to the program and guide its activities away from lost causes, acknowledged mine-fields and clever booby traps.

Another possible advantage in using non-expert faculty members as staff relates to the nature of the institution and faculty attitude towards experts in education. As Mathis has pointed out, "the most frequent source of staff for teaching improvement agencies are the disciplines of education and psychology,"[8] and yet such disciplines have acceptability problems within an institution like Illinois State University.

The university is like a number of institutions throughout the country that changed from small, single purpose teachers' colleges to large, multi-purpose universities in the 1950s and 1960s. In such institutions, there is still a lingering distrust and antipathy by many faculty for anything to do with the process of education. As the institutions changed their focus many faculty tried to shake off the old teachers' college image and anything that smacked of teacher education. For many faculty, the School of Education has low credibility and they do not wish to be instructed about teaching by experts from that area.

A similar problem can confront the psychologist. "Psychologists particularly suffer a credibility gap in their relationships with other disciplines in which consultant help for improving teaching may be needed. This is especially true of the relationship between psychology and the humanities and arts."[9]

A teaching improvement program is a service for the faculty and should try to reach as many faculty as possible. By selecting its staff from a broad set of disciplines, it may lessen the concern faculty might have in seeking its assistance. Institutions like Illinois State University might benefit by having faculty development programs that are not staffed exclusively by experts in education.

It would be unwise to exclude experts altogether and, in fact, the Teaching-Learning Center at Illinois State has faculty from the School of Education and will use a psychologist this year. However, the majority of Associates have not been experts in faculty development and this fact may have broadened the kinds of requests and responses the Center has received.

Not being able to use experts is itself a disadvantage for it limits the depth of assistance that can be offered. Some input from experts is essential for it provides a basis of education for the rest of the staff as well as a body of conceptual knowledge for running the program. A balanced approach would use some faculty from education and psychology with faculty from other disciplines on campus.

At Illinois State University the Kellogg Associates have been appointed for one year and replaced with new Associates in the next year (though some attempt has been made to carry over one Associate each year to provide continuity in the program). At the end of the funding phase (four years) a core of faculty (eighteen to twenty faculty) will exist on campus who have worked as faculty developers. They have had on-the-job training and have dealt with signigicant issues that develop in running a faculty development program. They presumably carry this experience back to their College and department and could be called on to give leadership there should it be required. They also provide a stronger link between the Center, its functions and their own department.

A disadvantage, that is only now becoming apparent, is that some faculty who serve the university through the program may gain very little in terms of their own professional status within their teaching discipline. In two instances, faculty who had served as Associates were advised not to continue for a second year if they wished to be considered for promotion or tenure. Their service in the Center was hurting them, in the eyes of their colleagues, in the area of scholarship. Until teaching, and work associated with teaching, is put on the same level as other professional activities, the faculty who are to be used as staff may have to be drawn only from tenured and high ranking faculty. This is a limitation for the program, but a safeguard for faculty who do not seek a career in faculty development.

As the Associates work with the Center for only one year, they do not have a long term commitment to the activities of the Center--they tend to see it only in terms of their work for the year. They do not have a professional career commitment to faculty development nor can they be expected to see its long-range implications or take a broad view of the field. It is difficult for the part-time staff to fully grasp the conceptual basis for the program or place day-to-day activities within the overall context of the program. As Associates change each year, the experiences of previous years have to be given to them as information rather than as lived-through experiences. Also, new Associates have to be brought up to date with the Center and its operations and this can take quite some time, particularly when past and completed activities have to be explained and sometimes defended. The lack of continuity and the yearly change-over can be a problem, particularly with activities that spread beyond the working life of one group of Associates. The advantage of a new, energetic team is balanced by the disadvantage of their newness.

The major disadvantage in using non-experts is the most obvious one--they are not experts in the field of teaching in higher education. This is a severe limitation for a program when it is called on to provide expert counsel or when it is needed to give in-depth knowledge of the field. Yet it is not a limitation that need restrict the program unduly for very few of the issues that will be raised about the improvement of teaching have been solved to the satisfaction of the experts in the field. While it is true that a non-expert will not have the depth of knowledge about a particular area, he or she will probably be able to cope effectively with practical aspects of the situation sufficiently to handle the immediate problem.

The danger lies in the continued use of non-experts as a sufficient way to operate the program. An annual turnover of non-experts who are not committed to long-term self-development in the field keeps the program operating at a shallow

level. There will be no building of knowledge about the program for it to develop effectively and a specialist must be involved who has a long-term commitment to the program. This person can properly assume a long-term role in planning activities and in determining the roles the non-experts will play. This person, and possibly other experts, should also be encouraged to explore research into teaching improvement in higher education as part of the program's activities. Such research can involve the non-experts but it is more properly the province of the specialists. The research should relate directly to the work of the program; that is, it should have a direct bearing on the activities of the non-experts. A program that does not engage in research on effective teaching is severely limiting itself.

The Future

As higher education moves into the 1980s, it moves into a period of uncertainty and probable crisis. The faculty will be less mobile and older, there will be changing student demands on the faculty and on the curriculum, and there will be a greater external demand for accountability of teaching and learning. It is possible that in such a climate faculty development programs may become very important. Before they can meet this future opportunity, most programs have to: (1) become institutionalized, (2) operate at a relatively inexpensive level, and (3) demonstrate success with faculty.

Many programs in the U.S. at the present time are peripheral to the functions of their institution. They have been introduced through the administration rather than by a demand from the faculty; they are often supported by "soft" or grant money; they have been in operation only a short while and have short initial-life expectancy.[10] The Teaching-Learning Center at Illinois State is co-sponsored by the university and a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in support of a proposal written by the Dean of Undergraduate Instruction and the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The Center has an initial life period of four years.

To become institutionalized, programs have to have faculty support as well as backing from the administration. Faculty resent money being spent on "frill" activities, especially at a time when universities and colleges are facing heavy budget cuts. Added to this is the suspicion and concern created by any program that addresses itself to the improvement of teaching at a time when teaching is one source of information for decisions on the professional future of faculty. By having faculty from all areas of campus associated directly with its activities, a program can begin to allay doubts and demonstrate, using the credibility of its staff, the direction it will take. Using members of the faculty as staff should immediately demonstrate that the program is for the faculty and help build a faculty stake in its success and future.

The use of faculty in a teaching-improvement program need not be expensive and can be less expensive than bringing a team of experts in from outside the institution. The use of released-time for research is already an accepted practice on most campuses. An institutional commitment to released-time for improving teaching could surely find 1½ to 2 positions a year from across campus for involvement with the program. Such an instutional commitment to excellence in teaching would lend prestige to the positions and encourage

faculty to seek them out. A major benefit of such a move for the future is that it institutionalizes the program at the budget level and ties it directly to the teaching of faculty on campus. By rotating the cost among departments, it enables them to make a commitment for themselves, and for the institution, about effective teaching.

Evaluation of faculty development programs is difficult. The number of workshops and the head-count of faculty participants is only a small part of the answer and, too often, can be a numbers game played to please funding agencies. Numbers tell very little about the long-range impact of the program on teaching and learning. The success must be tested at the grass-roots level and there is an advantage in having faculty on the staff for they are closely tuned in to their colleagues' needs and strive to meet these needs. Colleagues working for colleagues and having institutional support may be in a good position to address the needs of the faculty and deal with them within the context of the institution.

Conclusion

Faculty in faculty development is a workable scheme. Although such staff cannot supply the in-depth knowledge of the expert, they can function effectively in a teaching improvement program. Given the difficulties facing higher education in the next decade, the use of faculty in faculty development work may be a wise and beneficial means of making such programs part of academic life in the future.

NOTES

1. Jerry G. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975) p. 151.

2. The Group for Human Development in Higher Education, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment (Change, 1974) p. 55.

3. Ibid., p. 54

4. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal p. 152

5. The Group for Human Development in Higher Education, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment p. 82.

6. Illinois State University Kellogg Project: First Annual Report, Appendix A, p. 14.

7. Ibid, p. 18.

8. Claude Mathis in Designing Teaching Improvement Programs, ed. Jack Lindquist (Berkeley, Cal.: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978) p. 108.

9. Ibid.

10. There are several programs in operation in the United States which have been in operation for some time, including programs at Northwestern University, Illinois; Michigan State University and the University of Michigan. Some of the longer established programs have been supported, in part, by foundation grants.

Faculty Training for Mid-Career Change*

Elmer Van Egmond

Introduction

Recently there has been a rapid increase in the incidence of people changing to a new career after having pursued a given line of endeavor for several years. This increased activity has resulted in a greater degree of both recognition and acceptance of the necessity and desirability of mid-career changes. In previous generations, the American culture tended to emphasize, value, and expect a high degree of stability and continuity in work life. In the post World War II period, rapid changes occurred in technology, consumer preferences, and the state of the national economy. These and other related factors helped accelerate the rate of obsolescence for certain skills, created demand for other sets of skills, and generated the need to invent new work roles. It is now commonly stated that one should expect an average of five to seven career changes in a life time and today's college students should be preparing for careers which have not yet been invented. It seems mind-boggling to contemplate. On the other hand, when I entered college, it was not possible for me to consider entering a career as a computer programmer, a jet pilot, or any role associated with the now giant television or plastic industries.

A Theoretical Framework

It is frequently assumed that career change involves moving to a drastically different area of work. There are occasional reports in the newspapers and Sunday Supplements about the successful, hard-driving businessman who decides to chuck it all and move to the country to dip candles. This type of "dropout" phenomenon makes good copy, but is not representative of the majority of changes that occur. It is much more likely that the change will involve moving to a position related to a former area of work. For example, a common change in career for persons in education is a move from classroom teaching to an administrative position or a research post. This type of change is consistent with the views of John Holland[1] and the work of Richard Bolles[2] who view career choice, not as a capricious event, but as reflecting clusters of interests, values, and preferences. An example of clarifying preferences for people who share similar types of interest is provided by Bolles[3] in an exercise labeled "The Party." People whose interests are similar are presumed to have gathered into six groupings in different parts of a room and the task is to choose which group one would join first, then move to a second choice, and finally to a third choice. It is well to note that if one expresses preference for people who are interested in working with machines or tools and deal primarily with inanimate objects, one may not be very comfortable or happy with people who like to work with people in a teaching or caring role. As additional

*Paper presented at the Professional and Organizational Network in Higher Education National Conference in Tulsa, Oklahoma, November 1978.

areas of preference, value orientation, and patterns of interest are taken into consideration, career change can be understood as a much more orderly and predictable event than it appears to the casual observer. When a change of career is being considered, there is a critical need to provide counseling, advising, and informational services to assist the person in thoroughly assessing and clarifying their preferences, needs, and options.

Loss of job

Assistance in career change is especially critical when a loss of position occurs. The loss may be for reasons of physical disability or due to other factors outside the control of the individual. In higher education, losing a job due to non-renewal of temporary contracts and decisions not to grant tenure are becoming more frequent. The loss of one's job, for whatever reason, tends to be a very difficult experience for most people to handle. Perhaps it is because in our culture, work is so closely linked to one's identity and is central to a definition of who and what one is.

Reactions to the crisis event of losing a job tend to include characteristic elements. They may not necessarily occur in the exact sequence presented for a given individual, nor include all of the items listed. The initial reaction to the news of a job loss is very likely to be disbelief and shock. When the realization sinks home that this is really happening, emotional reactions of anger, loneliness, and depression occur. Physical distress and ailments may likely develop as evidenced in trouble with sleeping, eating, and experiencing various aches and pains. A sense of panic can well up as certain implications of the loss of one's job are realized. The individual is not sure they can go on, or face their friends and colleagues, and tell their family. This reaction is so strong that some persons continue to leave their homes and return on the same schedule as though working and conceal their loss of job from friends, neighbors, and in some cases, even their spouses. A strong sense of guilt often develops with a series of Monday morning quarterbacking "If I had only done this," or "not done that" speculations. Another tendency is to project blame for the unfortunate turn of events onto the "system," the "conservatives," or the "liberals," the "power bloc," or anyone but oneself or the real factors. For satisfactory resolution of the crisis, it is necessary that the individual come to understand and accept the reality of the situation and begin to direct their attention and energies to the task of planning next steps.

As the number of entering freshman begin a steeper decline in the next few years, it is likely that larger numbers of faculty members will lose jobs. As this trend develops, the shock of job loss can be eased and the process of considering a new career direction enhanced with the provision of effective career counseling services.

Dehiring Instead of Dismissing

In situations where unsatisfactory performance is a serious concern, rather than dismissal, the chairperson or dean may engage in a process of "dehiring." As defined by Lawrence Steinmetz, [4] dehiring is an attempt to encourage the person to quit and move to another institution. It is a gradual process of reducing compensation by awarding minimal or zero salary increases and reducing perquisites such as graduate assistants, office location and appointments, travel funds, and access to secretarial

and other support services. The problem with this approach is that the person may not get the message that they are supposed to up and quit. A second difficulty is that the person may want to leave but be unable to secure another position. The dehiring process has the effect of feeding into a downward spiral of lowered productivity and morale and frequently results in collusion between the chairperson and the low performer to co-exist in mutual dissatisfaction and misery. This approach to the problem of low performance avoids diagnostic work, confronting and dealing with the problem and the person, and essentially blocks out any attempt to help. In such cases, a severe shock reaction tends to occur when the person finally realizes what is happening.

Factors Affecting Career Change

Although the change from one career to another is motivated by a complex combination of forces and events, several of the factors influencing this decision can be identified. A number of these items are not under the control of the individual as they derive from persons, conditions, or events external to the individual being affected by them. In the field of education, a lack of teaching positions in public schools as well as higher education virtually makes loss of a job synonymous with loss of a career. The shrinking job market in education follows from a declining birth rate as one major contributing influence. Changing attitudes and values in the general population have contributed to a change in the pattern of student enrollments. In many instances, old programs have been eliminated and new or expanding programs thwarted or limited by a lack of funds. Loss of one's job may result from one or a combination of these factors.

Another set of conditions which affect career change develop more directly from the person. Examples of such internal forces include the strength of safisfaction or dissatisfaction with one's work; orientation toward risk taking; personal ambition or need for money, status, and power; relative importance of security or maintaining the status quo as compared with seeking adventure and new experiences. A new element has recently become important in the decision process where career change involves moving to a new location. In the past few years, the value of housing has accelerated rapidly and the cost of acquiring a new home with a new mortgage may serve as a deterent to relocation.

Needs for Successful Career Change

Although the pool of available information concerning career change is growing, there are presently considerable gaps in our knowledge about what makes a successful career change happen and what causes other change attempts to fail. Some generalizations have emerged, however, from a growing pool of case history information, evaluation of career change programs, and research. As has already been indicated, chances for a successful change are increased when the new career is consistent with the person's pattern of values, interests, and preferences. Determination of this degree of consistency is best determined by the person if they have developed a clear understanding of where they have been, where they are now, and where they want to go. Career change also requires a willingness to take some risks, to accept some disappointments, and to be able to bounce back and keep trying. It is very important

for a person considering a career change to have realistic expectations about the amount of time and energy required. Searching for a new position is hard work. Searching for a position in a new field is much harder work. A reasonable estimate of the time required to complete the change to a new career is from six to eighteen months. The odds for success are substantially increased as a consequence of undertaking a program of careful and thorough preparation. This should enable the individual to understand a good bit about the nature of the new career and to begin developing a network of contacts in the selected career field. It also includes developing clear knowledge about what one has to offer to a new career position.

Career Change Programs

Organized programs have been developed in a number of institutions and agencies to provide assistance in planning for career development and career change. In the field of higher education, the Professional Development Center of the Kellogg Project at Illinois State University provides a comprehensive program of consultation and financial support for career development and career change. A detailed description of the work of the Center is provided in the body of the "Third Annual Report."

Another example of a single-institution program is provided at Wittenberg University. Supported by a grant from the Lilly Foundation, the program provides financial assistance to faculty members for appropriate training to move from overstaffed teaching areas to other specialties and administrative posts within the University.

At another level, three state university systems[5] are currently offering programs to faculty members for career change. The State University System of Florida provided about $40,000 for each of three years to assist faculty members to move from overstaffed programs to related disciplines of growing enrollment. The program, funded for the period 1974 through 1976, provided salary and general support for travel and books.

One of the earliest career change programs was initiated by the University of Wisconsin System in 1972 in response to a state of financial exigency and retrenchment. The program is currently funded on a shared basis by the System and the campuses and provides salary and tuition costs for a faculty member training for new duties in the state system.

In the State of Pennsylvania, funding is provided by the Pennsylvania State College Educational Services Trust Fund. The fund was created through agreement between the union and management to establish a trust fund for faculty development. The program began in 1976 and is continuing, with assistance from the campuses, to provide salary and general support to faculty members entering approved training programs.

The most recent program was initiated in 1977 in the State University of New York System and is funded by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Secondary Education and local campuses. Participating faculty members receive salary, tuition waivers within SUNY, plus general support.

Another approach to assisting faculty members in career change is illustrated by the Careers in Business Project.[6] Sponsored by the New York State Regents and funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Rockefeller Foundation, and several large corporations, a tuition-free summer program is offered to doctoral students at the dissertation stage and recent Ph. D.'s in the Humanities and related social sciences. The seven-week summer program was held at the New York University Graduate School of Business Administration this past summer for 50 persons. The purpose was to provide an orientation to the corporate world and a rigorous introduction to basic business skills. The program will be offered again during the summer of 1979.

Governmental units at Federal, State and Municipal levels are involved in an extensive career development and career change program with funding under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). A special program utilizing CETA and related state and municipal programs has been developed by the Employment Security Department of the State of Washington. The Career Change Assistance Project is designed specifically to aid persons who are unemployed for health, economic, or technological reasons and must make a career change. The program will provide a comprehensive program of counseling, testing, job search assistance, academic or vocational training, and follow-up to assist those who must make a career change to again become productively employed.

A second career training program of the Federal Aviation Administration has been in operation for more than five years. It provides a maximum of two years of salary plus general support for air controlers to help them prepare for a new career when they can no longer continue in their specialty. Informal evaluations suggest that the training program for second careers would be more effective if they were not in direct competition with a retirement option or Workman's Compensation Programs and if a program of career counseling and career information services could be provided in addition to financial support.

In the industrial sector, greater acceptance has developed for the general concept of career development and career mobility. General activity includes such things as improved work on job descriptions, job posting, the development of career ladders, and facilitating career mobility within the corporate structure. A major commitment of money and time is being provided for in-house training programs and tuition grants for outside study to assist employees in performance improvement and career advancement. Specific examples of corporate programs include the Boeing Aircraft Company's mentoring program to help engineers move to related career areas when the need for their specialty declined; the attention given to career planning as part of the training and organizational development program of the corporate educational services of the General Electric Company; and the cooperative program developed between Union Carbide, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the University of Tennessee to improve the quality of vocational-technical instructors and management training while expanding career options for both academic and industrial personnel.

Summary

As the incidence of career change has become more frequent, societal acceptance has also increased. With rapid changes in the need for certain areas of competence and skill, a growing awareness has developed of the need to not only accept the notion of mid-career change but to provide assistance for those persons who need and want to make this transition. Based on experience gained in a number of career change programs, it has demonstrated its usefulness as an important strategy for developing and managing human resources. There are strong indications that successful career change is most likely to occur when a comprehensive program of counseling, career information and strategy planning services are provided as a total program to support the person in the change. Chances for a successful change are also improved when the new career area is in a related field and is reasonably consistent with the interests, values, and preferences of the individual.

As existing programs develop additional years of experience and more intensive evaluations are completed, firmer guidelines will become available for those who are directing programs to assist persons in career change as well as for those planning to introduce one.

FOOTNOTES

1 John L. Holland, Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Careers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

2 Richard N. Bolles, The Three Boxes of Life. Berkeley, California: Ten Speed Press, 1978.

3 Bolles, p. 127.

4 Lawrence Steinmetz, "Is It Wrong To Fire a Manager?" Management of Personnel Quarterly, Summer 1968. pp. 3-11.

5 For a more complete description of state system programs, see Charles B. Neff, "Faculty Retraining in Four States," AAHE Bulletin, October 1978.

6 Dorothy G. Harrison and Ernest R. May. Careers in Business (a report of the first year of the project) Albany, New York: The Regents of the University of the State of New York, 1978.

University of Lancaster
4th International Conference
on Higher Education
29 August - 1 September 1978

Working Party on
"Staff Development"

EVALUATING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

By
D. M. Rhodes
College of Education
Illinois State University

Abstract

Anyone wishing to determine the quality of a staff development program is immediately faced with serious difficulties. Among these are conflicting value principles, lack of agreement on criteria, insufficient baseline information, and lack of precise data-gathering techniques. These difficulties are such that it is virtually impossible at present to make a sound and rigorous appraisal of staff development work.

Three different approaches to evaluation which illustrate the principal problem in assessing staff development programs are described. These are designated the "output" model, the "outcomes" model and the "instructional" model. Very different evaluative conclusions can be reached when these models are applied separately in judging the same staff development program. Use of one evaluation model may reveal considerable success; but, when another is employed, few positive results may be found.

Logical and empirical requirements for a systematic method of evaluating staff development programs are then outlined. Basic to fulfilling these requirements is the need for a coherent conception of staff development in higher education, a conception current thinking could help to provide, but which has not yet emerged. Finally, the argument is advanced that, without systematic evaluation, staff development programs in the next decade will not fare well in the competition for resources, and to this end a brief agenda for the '80s is proposed.

Anyone wishing to determine the quality of staff development programs is immediately faced with serious difficulties. Not the least of these difficulties is the lack of agreement on what constitutes staff development and how it should be carried out (see Brown, 1977). In fact, "active disagreement" better describes the reaction of some staff development personnel to others engaged in the same endeavor. While significant disagreements on ends and means may be the mark of a dynamic profession, they also lead to problems in evaluation. Unless we are clear about what we are doing, it is unlikely that we can determine accurately the quality of our work.

It is not surprising, therefore, that, while program evaluation is considered to be an important function in staff development, often little is said about how the evaluation should be carried out. As an example, a recent publication on establishing teaching improvement programs devotes only 12 pages of 370 to evaluation, and these contain for the most part simply accounts of the problems which may be anticipated (Lindquist, et al., 1978). Criteria for success vary widely; what is regarded as valuable in one staff development program may have little significance in another. Some approaches to evaluation in staff development are actually descriptions of program structure and activities. They are really not evaluative in the sense of determining quality (see Bergquist and Phillips, 1977).

Given these circumstances, it may seem foolhardy to attempt any analysis of evaluation as applied to staff development. Nevertheless, there are some matters which can be clarified, though I would not presume to offer a final solution to any of the problems inherent in the evaluation process. I would like first to describe three evaluative models which can be used in assessing staff development programs, and also to illustrate that very different conclusions can be reached when these models are applied in turn in judging the same program. Use of one model for evaluation may reveal considerable success; when another is employed, few positive results may be found.

To present a complete scheme for evaluating staff development is beyond the scope of this paper and the competence of the author, but some logical and empirical requirements can be found for a systematic method of evaluating staff development programs. Basic to fulfilling these requirements is the need for a coherent conception of staff development in higher education, one which current thinking could help to provide. Without systematic evaluation, staff development in the next decade will not fare well in the competition for resources.

Evaluative Models

An examination of the general literature on program evaluation (e.g., Weiss, 1972; Worthen and Sanders, 1973) and that concerned specifically with staff development (e.g., O'Connell and Meeth, 1978) reveals two general "evaluative models" which can be used as the basis for assessing quality of development programs and activities. The first of these I term the "output" model. In this model the standards of achievement and success in staff development are focused upon the activities performed and the efforts made. Quality is directly related to the amount of work that is carried on: the number of workshops presented, conferences held, courses run, consultations carried out, publications dispensed, and newsletters published. Especially important are

patronage measures of "how many came" or "how many enrolled." The output model may not be conceptually sophisticated, but it can be applied easily. There are relatively few data-gathering problems with which to contend, and a staff development program in its initial stage can use the output model to catalog its accomplishments (see Kellogg Project, 1976).

The second model may be called the "outcomes" model. In this model the standards for achievement and success are focused upon the "effects" or "impact" of the staff development program. Quality is determined by measures of the amount of impact on participants, the degree of change toward some desired end, or by some combination of the two. When program objectives are clearly specified in advance, outcomes are also judged in relation to how well the intended results have been achieved. What is the impact on the target population? What is the level of participant acceptance, approval, or approbation? What changes in teaching practices can be observed? Did the program achieve aim "A" or goal "B?" These questions are characteristic of the outcomes model. It is more difficult to implement than the output model because it necessitates using more complex techniques for data-gathering and analysis (see Habeshaw, 1977); Rothman and Robinson, 1977).

A third model, derived from a conception of staff development work, can be designated the "instructional" model. It has a process orientation. In this approach, staff development is considered to be a form of continuing professional education. Evaluation of a staff development program is thus equivalent to evaluation of a continuing education program for staff (Rhodes, 1977a). The focus of the evaluation is on the design and implementation of instruction for a particular adult clientele with specific personal and professional needs and goals. In this situation the clientele are staff members themselves. They become a new type of "non-traditional" student clientele in higher education.

Standards used to determine success and achievement in the instructional model are related to the nature of the educational enterprise: quality is determined by the degree to which a program for staff development, i.e., for continuing professional education, meets predetermined standards for conducting instructional programs of this kind. It will be judged on the extent to which elements such as "needs assessment," "referent situation analysis," "participant involvement" and "supportive environment" are recognized and incorporated in a systematic fashion into the instructional process. Learning and subsequent modification of professional performance by participants in staff development activities are viewed as achievements of the participants, not of the program. Such changes (or lack of them) may be used as data in evaluating a program, but do not in themselves constitute measures of success or failure. This approach is what I call "proximity" evaluation. That is, we try to determine the extent to which practice approximates an ideal formulation. "Discrepancy" evaluation has similar characteristics (see Provus, 1973).

Application of Evaluative Models

The use of these three models may result in very different evaluative conclusions when they are applied in judging a specific staff development program or activity. How different conclusions are reached can be illustrated through using the models to evaluate the "College Teaching Laboratory," a joint undertaking of the Kellogg Project Teaching-Learning Center and the College of Education at Illinois State

University. Employing video-tape equipment already available on the campus, a two-room facility with multiple cameras, microphones, and "split-screen" capability has been made available since September, 1977, to teaching staff who wish to make tapes of their teaching for purposes of diagnosis and improvement. These tapes enable staff to see both themselves and their students simultaneously at any given time during a lecture, discussion, tutorial, seminar, or discussion session. The equipment is operated by a student employee of the Center, and tapes are viewed only by the staff member and persons serving as consultants.

During the first semester of operation the Lab was used by some 25 teaching staff, each of whom made at least one tape, with some making as many as four. Most of these staff members were graduate students in their first year of teaching in higher education. Their involvement was part of a regular induction experience conducted by staff from the College of Education. The laboratory also served as meeting room for some graduate classes in which instructors used video-tapes as part of the instructional process.

If the "output" model is used to evaluate this activity, the College Teaching Laboratory would seem to be successful. A faculty for instructional improvement was established which made full use of existing equipment at a total cost for new materials of only about $75.00. After three months, 25 staff had obtained a more realistic picture of their classroom performance and now had a basis for improvement in the future. Much of the work was done with inexperienced teaching staff so that difficulties were identified and dealt with before they became major problems.

A different picture emerges, however, when the "outcomes" model is applied. In fact, it is difficult to determine any outcomes which can be attributed to the Lab except for participant attitudes. On the basis of data from questionnaires and informal interviews, we can say that those persons who made tapes were quite pleased with the experience and indicated that they found it to be quite informative. Though many of the participants also indicated they modified some aspects of their teaching after viewing themselves on tapes--and some modifications were observed--it is doubtful if the Kellogg Center can claim that the Teaching Lab was responsible for the changes. Other factors, including simply more teaching experience, might be quite as significant. When continued participation is used as an indicator of impact, the Lab does not score well: none of the persons who used the facility during the first semester returned to make additional tapes during the following semester.

If the Lab receives reasonably high marks with the output model and relatively low ones with the outcomes model, then use of the "instructional" model of evaluation produces still a third result. When judged against the requirements for designing and implementing a continuing professional education program for teaching staff, the process used to establish and conduct the Lab can be seen to have both significant strengths and serious deficiencies. For instance, an assessment of the need for a video-taping facility was conducted as part of a baseline data study of the status of teaching at Illinois State (Rhodes, 1977b). The 64 "instructional leaders" interviewed in this study indicated that analysis of their teaching using video-tapes was something that only half had ever done, but that it ranked highest in the activities they "would like to try." The inadequacy of the needs assessment became quite obvious, however. The sample

was not sufficiently representative of the teaching staff as a whole, nor were the responses good indications of the actual sentiments of the instructional leaders. None of those who said they wanted to try video-taping their teaching actually did so. It should be added also that this important group of potential participants were not consulted or invited to help in setting up the Lab. There was no participant involvement in the planning stages.

An analysis of the referent situation, in this case classroom teaching at Illinois State, did not sufficiently emphasize one of the most significant conditions, lack of rewards for change by potential clientele. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that this condition was recognized, but largely disregarded because it did not support the project being undertaken. Most teaching staff at Illinois State apparently do not have much motivation to improve their teaching. We have evidence that they believe the quality of teaching in the university is already more than satisfactory and do not think they would be rewarded even if improvements were made. Institutional pressures, though important for the graduate teaching assistants when they first began, also did not suffice once these instructors had demonstrated their fitness to teach through a semester's work. On the positive side, a supportive environment for change was provided by the Lab personnel and consultants; many participants remarked that what they had anticipated would be a threatening experience was instead interesting and informative.

We can conclude that with respect to meeting the standards for planning and implementing one component of a continuing education program for staff, those responsible for the College Teaching Laboratory (chiefly the author of this paper) would receive good marks for trying to proceed systematically, but lower ones for lack of sophistication in their efforts. (It may be they needed staff development.) The evaluative verdict using the instructional model is mixed; it contains both positive and negative judgments of quality.

Systematic Evaluation

I believe these examples illustrate that at present it is virtually impossible to conduct a sound and rigorous appraisal of staff development work. Even if one model is applied rigorously and sophisticated measurement devices are employed, questions raised by the other models are left unanswered. If all are used, the conflicting results are such that no adequate decisions about quality can be made. The soundness of the objectives is hardly questioned at all. What I would like to offer for consideration is not a panacea for this difficulty, but rather a series of steps through which a resolution might be achieved.

A first step would be to construct one or more coherent conceptions of staff development which can be extended systematically to provide a pattern for evaluation efforts. I have suggested that we think of staff development as a continuing professional education program for a specific group of adult "non-traditional" students. Another conception might be that of "counseling," with staff as clients. A third could be a "training" approach adapted from business or the military. Even the "horticulturalist" position might have possibilities. Staff development centers do have many characteristics of public health clinics and often treat bad teaching as a social disease, though I am not sure where an extension of this view might lead. In any case, some consistent conception of what staff development is about will be necessary if any program evaluation is

to be more than an ad hoc venture governed by expediency and political considerations.

A second, concurrent, step is to give more attention to a critical examination of presently used materials and methods in development. Self-instructional packages on teaching skills, for example, could be analyzed to determine what they reveal about the assumptions underlying staff development processes. Thought and practice to be found in any number of programs presently in operation could contribute to clarifying the concept of staff development--if that thought and practice could be methodically reviewed. Unfortunately, money and time for thinking are not always built into program budgets and timetables. Staff development personnel are also often inclined to say "Let's get on with it," which is no doubt one reason why they took up the work in the first place. I am not calling for a replacement of "vigor" with "rigor" (since I understand that rigor mortis may soon follow), but am simply asking that those responsible for communications networks, conferences, and journals consider finding more time and space for analytic presentations and invite these if necessary.

A third step would be to make explicit, for any conception of staff development chosen, logical and empirical requirements for systematic evaluation. Logical requirements are those inherent in our understanding of "evaluation" as a concept. Empirical requirements are those principles fundamental to data-collection and analysis. Among these I would include:

a) Value principles: statements of what constitutes quality in staff development activities. Evaluation implies determining worth; it is more than description.

b) Performance factors: elements which are to be evaluated. These are the significant aspects of the program which must be judged.

c) Value criteria: conditions to be met in order to establish quality, or lack of it. Performance factors are judged in relation to the criteria.

d) Value categories: descriptions of gradations in quality. These describe various classifications such as "excellent" and "very poor."

e) Indicators: types of data about performance required in the evaluation. In the absence of appropriate data, evaluations are either statements of preference or prejudice.

f) Data-gathering procedures: specifications of sources and instruments. The data required should determine the procedures; available procedures should not determine what data are collected.

g) Appraisals: statements about the way in which various performance factors were categorized. These should answer questions about program quality.

If these basic elements are spelled out in detail, then selection of staff development conceptions and evaluative models appropriate for a given program can proceed on a more rational basis than is now the case.

A fourth step is to integrate research and development activities. Presently some research is done on staff development, and some staff development is based upon research, but in my estimation the state of the art is such that these activities are seldom thought about conjointly. Certainly this would seem to describe the reports in a recent publication on staff development in higher education (Elton and Simmonds, 1977). Research on evaluation is in short supply and is especially needed on the effects that program evaluations have on ongoing development activities. Staff are expected to change, and improve, through evaluation of their work; does the same thing apply to staff development? Do programs actually improve; and if so, how? These questions merit further inquiry.

It is my contention that, unless we proceed with these or similar steps, staff development will face serious problems in the coming decade. Like programs for blacks and women in the States, staff development is a relative latecomer to the higher reaches of academia. In many circles it is considered a "frill" and, as such, expendable. "Last hired, first fired" may well apply to staff development as it does to other programs. There are always pressures from established departments which would like to claim the development funds for their own budgets, even if these departments seldom have to demonstrate either managerial efficiency or educational effectiveness.

The ability to demonstrate quality in professional performance does not guarantee tenure for staff nor will it insure a permanent place for staff development in higher education. Systematic evaluation, however, shows more promise than appeals to good will, especially when it is coupled with sure faith, true grit, and close relationships with key administrative officers. I believe considerable progress toward systematization can be achieved during the next few years, though hopefully not at the expense of experimentation and intuitive insights. Collaborative efforts by persons of all persuasions will be needed.

An Agenda for the '80s

To this end I would like to propose a brief agenda for the 80s:

1979	establish a cooperative effort, international in scope, to improve the evaluation of staff development programs.
1980-81	review and assess alternative conceptions of staff development; incorporate research in the invention of new ones as needed.
1981-82	devise systematic models for evaluating staff development programs based upon the alternative conceptions; select representative programs to serve as pilot projects.
1983-84	test the evaluation models.
1985	prepare and distribute reports illustrating the use of various approaches to evaluation and the problems associated with each; determine areas for further research and development.

I am not convinced that the importance of staff development in higher education is such that the funding and leadership can be found for the kind of project I have outlined. If a major effort to improve evaluation (and thereby staff development programs themselves) cannot be supported, then I think it is safe to say that staff development itself is yet another fad making the rounds in higher education. If leadership and finances are forthcoming, then I know we will have more than enough demands on our energies in the next decade. I hope this will be the case.

References

Brown, George. "Some Myths of Staff Training and Development." Impetus, 6 (1977), 2-8

Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Steven. A Handbook for Faculty Development, Vol. II. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977, 294-301

Habeshaw, Trevor. "A Report on Two Contrasting Methods of Evaluating Attitudes of Staff to Development Programs." Assessment in Higher Education, 3 (1977), 49-72

Kellogg Project. First Annual Report. Illinois State University, 1976

Lindquist, Jack, ed. Designing Teaching Improvement Programs. Berkeley, California: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978

O'Connell, William R. and Meeth, L. Richard. Evaluating Teaching Improvement Programs. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1978

Provus, M. Discrepancy Evaluation. Berkeley, California: McCuchan, 1973

Rhodes, D.M. "Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs: A Prologue." Paper presented at the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, McMaster University, Ontario, 1977 (a)

Rhodes, D.M. "A First Step in Staff Development: Securing Baseline Data on Teaching Practice" in L. Elton and K. Simmonds, eds., Staff Development in Higher Education. Guildford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1977 (b), 58-64

Rothman, Arthur and Robinson, Sarah. "Evaluating a Training Course for University Teachers." Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 7 (1977), 19-37

Weiss, Carol H. Evaluating Action Programs. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972

Worthen, Blaine R. and Sanders, James. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, Ohio: Jones Publishing, 1973.

A Test of the Radiation of Information from Two Human Resource Workshops*

Melvin A. Goldstein
Department of Psychology

During the academic year 1976-77, a series of workshop programs were presented under the auspices of the Kellogg Project's Teaching-Learning Center. The workshops were designed and presented by personnel from the Student Counseling Center. They were open to University faculty members and provided training in two different approaches to organizing and managing classroom discussion. The two programs were called "Learning Through Discussion (LTD) and "Education Through Student Interaction (ETSI).

The workshops were announced to all members of the faculty and enrollment was on a volunteer basis. The workshops were for a half-day period and included the presentation of information, demonstration, active participation in practice sessions and opportunities for raising questions and discussion.

This study is concerned with determining the breadth of impact of a particular faculty training intervention, particularly to determine whether or not a ripple effect had occurred in relation to information presented in the faculty workshops.

The rationale for the study was to determine if the ultimate effect of a human resources development program extended beyond the population directly involved. It was assumed that being a member of the University faculty did not necessarily provide linkage to other professionals within a structured pattern of personal interaction or group identification. It was, then, first necessary to identify those persons who were perceived to be members of each workshop participant's group. This was accomplished by a peer nomination procedure providing data for a basic sociogram of each participant's professional contacts. This was done by asking each workshop participant to name the person with whom they had the most professional contact. This established a pool of primary or first level contacts for the workshop participants. When the primary contact people were approached in the data collection process, they were asked to also name the person with whom they had most professional contact, thus providing a group of secondary level contacts. A third group of subjects was obtained by random selection of names from the faculty directory eliminating anyone who participated in the workshops or was mentioned as either a primary or secondary contact. Utilizing these subject panels, the design of the study included three groups from each workshop: the participants, the first level (Direct) contacts, second level (Indirect) contacts, plus a control group.

For the dependent measure, a ten-item True-False test of knowledge of information presented during the two types of workshops was prepared by the workshop staff. The criterion was the number of correct items obtained. The items were

*This is a summary of the paper. Those wishing to receive a copy of the paper should correspond directly with Dr. Goldstein.

constructed to be specific to information presented in the workshop sessions. Therefore, the test should differentiate between those who had direct access to relevant information and those who had secondary or no access to the information.

Approximately four weeks after the end of a workshop session, the participants and the first level (Primary) professional contact nominees were asked to respond to the test. The instructions asked the subjects to answer all the questions they could, and then to place a check mark next to each unanswered item. They were then instructed to record their best guess on the correct response for the unanswered items. This procedure provided that all items were responded to by each subject and provided an indication of the items on which subjects guessed.

The basic prediction was that the amount of knowledge about a workshop program would be greatest among workshop participants, be greater among those who had primary contact with a workshop participant than those who had secondary (Indirect) contact, and least among those having no contact at all.

An analysis of the data, using a one-way analysis of variance and the Newman-Keuls test for differences between means, supported the hypothesis of a decreasing number of correct responses as social distance from the workshop participant increases. In the Learning Through Discussion (LTD) workshop samples, the pattern of statistically significant differences indicated that the transmission of information was effectively extended from participants to their primary professional contacts. There were no significant differences between responses of the participants and people in either secondary contact or control conditions. In the Education Through Student Interaction (ETSI) participant groups, a slightly different form of ripple effect was established. These participants exhibited significantly more information than their first order contacts. In turn, scores from both first and second order contact groups were significantly greater than those of the control group.

The findings do establish that information obtained by participants in a workshop radiates to professional associates who were not directly involved in the program. This indicates that a ripple effect serves to extend the breadth of impact beyond persons in attendance at a workshop. Information passed in this manner could serve to create interest in participation in the same or other types of interventions offered, stimulate evaluation and discussion and change behavior in the direction of the program tenents.

This study has demonstrated a methodology to evaluate the extent of a ripple effect in a relatively unstructured social situation, i.e., a university faculty. In discussing the study, the author provides a number of suggestions for future approaches to this type of investigation and points out the importance of cost/benefit considerations in a human development program.